DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 217 EA 011 508

AUTHOR	Fullan, Michael; And Others
TITLE	OD in Schools: The State of the Art. Vol. II: Review of Research on OD. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Center for Policy Research, New York, N.Y.; Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 78
CONTRACT	400-77-0051; 400-77-0052
NOTE	65p.; For related documents, see EA 011 348 and EA 011 509-511; Preface may not reproduce clearly due to light print
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Organizational Development; Organizational Effectiveness; School Districts
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; United States

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this document, the second of a five-volume series, was to analyze the various reviews of organizational development (OD) in general, and case studies of school districts in particular, in order to synthesize information about OD as it applies to schools. The review is organized into four main categories: (1) values, themes, and goals of OD; (2) operating characteristics; (3) outcomes; and (4) the future. The volume closes with a bibliography containing some 70 sources. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED168217

OD IN SCHOOLS: THE STATE OF THE ART

VOL. II: REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON OD

Michael Fullan
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Matthew B. Miles
Center for Policy Research
New York, N.Y.

Gib Taylor
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada

August, 1978

EA 011 508

Final report to National Institute of Education, Contract Nos. 400-77-0051,0052. Ideas and conclusions contained in this report should not be viewed as representing the official policy of the National Institute of Education.

PREFACE

This study of the state of the art of Organization Development (OD) in education consists of a comprehensive assessment of the state of knowledge of OD in education and the nature and extent of use of OD in school districts in the United States and Canada. The study is divided into five separate volumes, all under the general title, OD in Schools: the State of the Art.

Volume I, Introduction, includes an introduction and overview of the project, and an executive summary of the main findings and conclusions of the different components of the study.

Volume II, Review of Reviews, assesses the state of knowledge of OD in the research literature by reviewing over fifty recent sources. This review concentrates on theoretically and empirically based overviews, comparative studies, commentaries and critiques of OD in general, and OD in education in particular. The review focusses on a review of reviews, but also includes recent major case studies of OD in education. The literature review involves four major themes or aspects of OD: 1) assumptions, values, goals and definitions of OD, 2) operating characteristics (conditions affecting entry, initiation and continuance of OD programs), 3) effects or impact, and 4) the future of OD.

Volume III, OD Consultants/OD Programs in School Districts, consists of two empirical studies of OD in school systems which we carried out. The first study involved identifying and gathering questionnaire data on over 300 OD consultants in education in the United States and Canada. Information was collected on the location, position, background, training, OD approaches and extent of activities of the consultants in working with school districts. Nominations were obtained from the consultants of school districts which they thought were involved in "sustained" (lasting a minimum of 18 months) OD programs. These nominations were used to construct a sample of school districts with sustained OD programs. Detailed information by questionnaire and telephone was collected from a final sample of 76 districts. Data were gathered and analyzed on the size of districts, type of OD program, problems addressed, approaches taken, how the program got started and on a whole host of factors involved in the initiation and operation of the program. Direct information was also obtained on the outcomes of the programs - impact on the organization and on students, attitudes toward OD and its diffusion, and the degree of institutionalization of the program in the district. Multiple regression analyses were carried out to determine the influence of district characteristics, and various operating factors on the outcomes of the OD effort. Several clear and important new findings about the nature, use and effects of OD were uncovered, and are discussed in the report. To the best of our knowledge this study represents the first large scale quantitative analysis of OD programs in school districts.

Volume IV, Case Studies, contains three on-site case studies conducted by us. The three cases were selected from the sample of 76. The purpose of the case studies was to analyze in more detail different types of OD programs and their use. We interviewed a cross section of people in each district and analyzed available documentation. Each case study was selected to represent a different type of OD focus - Case Study A involved a Survey Feedback and Professional Development approach, Case Study B combined an MBO/OD focus, and Case Study C was primarily Curriculum based. The case study themes provided more illuminating and explanatory detail regarding the findings in the district analysis, as well as suggested some new ideas about the use of OD in school districts.

Volume V, Implications for Policy, Research and Practice, summarizes the main results of the project as a whole, sets out a revised working definition of OD in schools, and formulates a series of policy and research recommendations for different organiztions: local school districts, intermediate units, universities, state, provincial and federal government agencies concerned with education. Recommendations for how and if OD should be used and about the future of OD in schools are also discussed in Volume V.

A great deal of cooperation and help made this study possible. We would like to thank the OD consultants and school district personnel who provided so much time and information in giving us a rich array of information on their activities and programs. Leaders and other school personnel in the three case study sites - Winnipeg in Canada, Adams County District No. 12, and Garden City in the United States - deserve a special thanks for spending so much time with us.

Richard Schmuck made valuable suggestions regarding the design of the study. Frederick Mulhauser of NIE was helpful and supportive throughout the study in formulating important policy questions to be addressed. Joan May of OISE worked beyond the call of duty in providing administrative help and coordination. We would like to thank her for her strong support in helping us complete the project.

A limited number of copies of the volumes are available at cost:

Vol. I.	- Introduction and Executive Summary	$ 1.50
Vol. II.	- Review of Reviews	$ 4.00
Vol. III.	- OD Consultants/OD Programs in School Districts	$ 4.50
Vol. IV.	- Case Studies	$10.50
Vol. V.	- Implications for Policy, Research and Practice	$ 2.50
	Total for all five volumes -	$23.00

Please send requests and payment to Michael Fullan, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1V6.

CONTENTS

PREFACE i

INTRODUCTION 1

I. VALUES, THEMES AND GOALS OF OD 2

II. OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS 17
Case Studies in School Districts 17
Overviews and Comparative Reviews of OD 31

III. OUTCOMES OF OD 38
Case Studies in School Districts 39
Overviews and Comparative Reviews of OD 43

IV. THE FUTURE OF OD 49

REFERENCES 55

Introduction

The literature on OD is enormous, but fortunately has been the subject of several critical theoretical and empirical reviews. Our task was to carry out an analysis of these reviews especially those which focussed on education. In short, we set out to do a review of reviews. We identified basic reviews of OD in the literature, examined the contents since 1973 of the main journals relevant to OD (Journal of Applied Behavioral Science and recently the new journal Group and Organizational Studies, and the OD Practitioner) and sought out reviews and references from colleagues whom we knew were involved in OD in education. We did not undertake to review all case studies of OD in education, but we did identify all case studies presented at AERA in 1976, 1977 and 1978 (on the grounds that these studies had not yet been reviewed in the literature), and any other case studies which represented major efforts of OD researchers and trainers working in school districts. The overall purpose of the review was to analyze systematically the various reviews of OD in general and case studies of school districts in particular with a view to synthesizing the state of knowledge about OD as it might apply to its use in schools. This was a much needed task in order to assess the state of the art of OD in schools, because there have been few, if any, treatments of OD in the literature which illuminate its general conceptual base vis-a-vis education, let alone its application.[1]

The result of our search is contained in the bibliography at the end of this section. The bibliography contains some seventy sources. There are approximately 25 critiques or commentaries on OD (usually short position papers or critiques of different aspects of OD), 25 overviews, empirical and/or theoretical reviews of the field (systematic, empirical, and/or theoretical reviews of OD), 15 educational case studies of OD[2] and 5 textbooks on OD.

Among the critiques and commentaries, typical sources include Blumberg, 1976, Derr, 1976, Miles, 1976, Petrella, 1978 and Weisbord, 1978. Some of the major sources of overviews and conceptual synthesis and empirical reviews of OD are Alderfer, 1977, Franklin, 1976, Friedlander and Brown, 1974, Margulies et al, 1977, Pate et al, 1977, Porras and Berg, 1978. The case studies include analyses or reviews of recent educational

---

1 The one exception is Schmuck and Runkel's work, which they formulate using systems theory and which they document in considerable detail (Schmuck, Runkel, Arends and Arends, 1977). However, this is applied to their own work and not to the range of OD uses in the field of education as a whole.

2 It is difficult to be precise about the exact number of case studies. For example, Runkel and Schmuck (1976), report on about 20 different case studies within their four large projects, since 1967, and others (Conway, 1978, Milstein, 1978), are based on single case studies reported by two different authors using different perspectives.

OD programs in education written by the principal investigators of projects - the most well known, comprehensive and well documented one being the work of Schmuck, Runkel and colleagues at Oregon - see Runkel and Schmuck, 1974, 1976. We also review all other recent case studies of school districts which we could locate - in particular, Bassin and Gross, 1978, Coad, Miskel and Van Meter, 1976, Cohen and Gadon, 1978, Milstein, 1977, 1978 and Mohrman, Mohrman, Cooke and Duncan, 1977. Included in these studies are new applications of OD (e.g. new approaches and/or settings). The case studies of school districts used in the review (see the later sections describing the case studies) comprise all the case studies of OD in school districts which we could locate (i.e. case studies which involved more than one school in a district; the focus may still have been at the building level, but the program was coordinated at the district level and was seen as an OD program for the district).

Finally, we have also included for reference a small number of textbooks on OD. French and Bell (1973) consists of a particularly good overview of OD. Nadler 1977 contains a good treatment of data-based methods in OD. The other textbooks, Schmuck and Miles, 1971, (contains both text and case studies), Schmuck et al 1972, 1977, represent the only detailed reference books on OD applied to schools.

We used a common framework to analyze the literature similar to the one used in the other main parts of our study. The review is organized around four main categories - I. Values, Themes and Goals of OD (including assumptions, values, definitions and different approaches and goals of OD). II. Operating Characteristics (including entry conditions and other factors which facilitate and inhibit OD in operation such as the role of internal and external consultants, time line, resources, etc. - in short, those characteristics which distinguish successful and unsuccessful uses of OD). III. Outcomes of OD (consequences and impact on organizational climate and functioning, on teacher satisfaction, and especially on students), and IV. The Future of OD (conclusions, unresolved questions, prospects for OD in education).

I. VALUES, THEMES AND GOALS OF OD

There are a number of ambiguities and dilemmas involved in obtaining a clear picture of what OD is. Perhaps the best starting point is to identify the various definitions of OD contained in the sources we reviewed, and to use these definitions and other commentaries as a point of departure for discussing the main underlying dilemmas concerning values and assumptions and clarity about goals and approaches to OD. In more specific terms we first list several typical definitions of OD - concluding with a summary at the aggregate level of the critical elements contains in the definitions. Second, we introduce the main critiques of OD in the literature. Third, by examining the relationship between two (definitions) and three (critiques) we can begin to understand the value dilemmas and issues as well as emerge with a clearer picture of the different approaches or themes of OD.

The range of meaning of OD is contained in the following representative definitions of OD taken from the sources in the review:

In 1971, Miles and Schmuck (1971:2) described OD as:

> "OD can be defined as a planned and sustained effort to apply behavioral science for system improvement using reflexive, self-analytic methods."

In one of the most recent reviews six years later Alderfer (1977:272) refers to the practice of OD as:

> "Aimed toward improving the quality of life for members of human systems and increasing the institutional effectiveness of those systems."

French and Bell (1973) include the following elements in their definition:

> "organization development is a long-range effort to improve an organization's problem solving and renewal processes, particularly through a more effective and collaborative management of organization culture - with special emphasis on the culture of formal work teams - with the assistance of a change agent or catalyst, and the use of the theory and technology of applied behavioral science, including action research."

Derr (1974:11) states:

> "OD is a theory, a method and a value system (often hidden) for improving the human side of organizational life and thereby improving the task-goal accomplishments of their complex organizations."

Coad, Miskel and Van Meter (1976:1) define OD as:

> "OD is a process focussing on cultural change within an organization by applying behavioral science knowledge during a period of planned sustained effort. Moreover, this applied knowledge constitutes a technology with specific skills in areas such as communication, survey feedback, goal setting and problem solving."

Kimberly and Nielsen (1975:191) begin their article with the following description:

> "Organization development (OD), a philosophy of a technology for producing organizational change, has been implemented in a variety of organizations. Growing out of the human relations traditions in the forties and fifties, it is actually a pastiche of techniques developed in the behavioral sciences which focus on problems of organizational learning, motivation, problem solving, communications, and interpersonal relations."

In specifying some of the goals of the OD intervention, Schmuck et al (1975:11) list six explicit objectives:

1) develop clear communication through new communications skills and new procedures for clearer, more open communication.
2) build trust and increase understanding by opening close, personal communications so that hidden agendas and covert feelings can be dealt with in a climate of openness and authenticity.
3) involve more people in decision-making by encouraging information sharing and the identification of related responsibilities.
4) create an open problem-solving climate by helping companion groups identify more clearly the problems confronting them and to develop collaborative, workable plans for solving them.
5) increase group effectiveness by helping members analyze and improve the procedures for carrying out group tasks.
6) uncover conflict by providing participants with procedures that allow conflict to emerge.

Friedlander and Brown (1974: 315-316) use two basic themes or approaches to characterize OD - people oriented (human processual) approaches which attempt to change organizational processes in order to increase human fulfillment (primarily), and task accomplishment (secondarily, if at all) and technology oriented (techno-structural) approaches aimed at changing organizational structures in order to increase task accomplishment (primarily) and human fulfillment (secondarily, if at all).

Bassin and Gross (1978) have developed a high school renewal program working in high schools in New York City and define the program as OD based with the main goal:

> "To have the school institutionalize a systematic, participative process of problem solving and improvement as a regular, ongoing function within the school." (Bassin and Gross: 1978:5)

They also list a number of assumptions based on traditional OD practice (e.g., participation, systematic process, etc.) and list three assumptions which they claim deviate from traditional OD - practicality (short term tangible results), outside catalyst, and political skills. Of these three, only the latter one is not at all referred to in other definitions, although practicality is not explicitly stated.

Weisbord (1977) struggles with the problem by asking, "How do you know it works, if you don't know what it is". He responds by suggesting that OD consists of three main components:

> "There is only one right goal for OD: To confront... the tension between freedom and constraint. Secondly, OD's unique selling proposition is the task/process relationship...Above all, we should assert, and be prepared to prove this relationship - the obvious (and not so obvious, ways "process issues" block task accomplishment. Thirdly, OD's contract is to help people achieve valid data, make free choices, and develop internal commitment to act" (Weisbord, 1977:4-6).

He concludes:

> "no matter what the intervention is named, unless it addresses all three issues - not any one or any two, but all three:
>
> - freedom/constraint
> - task/process
> - data/choice/commitment
>
> it is not, cannot be, and should not be called "OD". To work on only one or two of the three equations is to work too hard for too little return - to be overly ambitious about what's possible, overly impressed with techniques and methods, and unappreciative of OD's limitations as well as its potential" (Weisbord, 1977:7).

Crockett (1978) and Petrella (1977) provide further support to the need for examining the question of balance between individual quality of life in the work place and organizational productivity. Both claim that the concern with the individual has been relatively neglected.

Petrella writes:

> "Most organizations are "about" output and productivity. How satisfied people are in their work is really a secondary value..If you want to be shown the exit, start talking about humanizing work or the quality of working life without showing that you are deeply concerned about productivity". (Petrella, 1977:2)

But he goes on to say:

> "Yet I see OD as trying to do something that will find a new balance in the work setting". (p.2)

And later:

> "In my view, the core of our mission in OD is to help people look IN HERE - into their own convictions - for another species of truth...I simply mean helping a person examine his/her

> own thoughts and feelings, helping a pair of people understand and work on their own relationship, helping a group or organization understand its real operating norms...By helping individuals and organizations discover their IN HERE truth, we can help them discover that they have some power, at their disposal to create a new and better future." (p.3).

Crockett (1978) states the same theme:

> "The place for OD to make permanent changes upon the system is to deal with the way people behave in it. To tinker with people's systems is but to treat the symptoms of their problem. The issue is the nature of human beings, and herein lies the long-term challenge of OD.
>
> Our organizations are not only in a place of constant change, but all too often they are bad places for human beings. Our organizational challenge is not just to help them become bigger, richer and more productive, but to help them become better places for people". (p. 12)

To summarize the preceding in an aggregate manner, the key words which define OD include: planned change; long range; organizational improvement in problem solving, communication, collaboration, participation, trust and in uncovering and confronting conflict; a focus on human processes and techno-structural factors in order to improve both task accomplishment and the quality of life of individuals; assistance of a change agent or catalyst; using behavioral science techniques to gather valid data in a reflexive, self-analytic fashion.[3] (see also Hayman, 1977).

Furthermore, OD involves all of these elements being used in a relational or balanced way (see Weisbord, 1977). If this is the case, a development program, regardless of its label is not OD unless it simultaneously is planned, long-range, involves a change agent or agents, focusses on organizational processes, tasks and structure, addresses the

---

[3] This property is explicitly alluded to by Schmuck and Miles (1971), Schmuck et al (1975), Weisbord (1977) and Petrella (1977). It remains tacitly clear in most of the other definitions that OD is not a technocratic, expert-advice-giving model of planned change, but one in which organization members themselves participate directly in organizational study, diagnosis, and change. This perhaps more than any other feature of the various definitions, distinguishes OD from other efforts to improve organizational life, such as management consulting, training, hiring/firing, reorganizations, etc.

development of individuals[4] as well as the organization, uses behavioral science techniques to generate valid data for informing both individual and organizational decisions.

If we apply the aggregate definition to the individual definitions we immediately recognize that certain key elements are not explicitly addressed. For example, several definitions do not make reference to individual development or to the quality of life for individuals (Coad et al, Schmuck and Miles, French and Bell, Kimberly and Nielsen, Schmuck et al). Some do not refer to task accomplishment (Kimberly and Nielsen, Schmuck et al). Only two authors (French and Bell, Schmuck and Miles) explicitly state that it is a "long range effort" or "sustained" attempt.[5] We are not claiming that the authors do not at all address the missing elements, but we are suggesting that by not explicitly referring to them, it is more likely that they are neglected or not addressed in a balanced manner with the other elements.

Critiques of OD range from exasperation at the number of definitions of OD to questions about the underlying values of OD.

Friedlander and Brown (1974) in their review summarize some of the main criticisms. Note that they refer to both espoused values and values in practice (see also Fullan, 1976).

> "The future of OD rests in part on its values and the degree to which its practice, theory, and research are congruent with those values. Thus far, most OD is initiated by the organization - for the purpose of furthering such organizational goals as increased performance. We seldom question the merits of these goals as part of the OD process. Though most OD practitioners and researchers in some degree value

---

[4] Most of these concepts are self-explanatory, but the reference to the development of individuals warrants a special emphasis. If by the "human side of things" we mean group processes (communication, group trust, etc.), we are not necessarily addressing directly the development of individuals in the organization. In our view, the limitations of the earlier individualistic approaches (e.g., T-Groups) have led some proponents of OD and systems oriented approaches to overreact and neglect the importance of individual development in the context of the organization. This is what Weisbord referred to when he claimed that OD must balance freedom and constraint. Case study B (Vol. IV) is a particularly good example of how individual development remains a primary focus while using a systems (MBO) approach to OD. Note also that the trend in recent critiques and definitions of OD seems to be reemphasizing the importance of the individual in an organizational context (e.g., Crockett 1978, Petrella, 1977).

[5] An issue such as "length of time" may be seen as a condition for success (see below), but it emerges as such a central issue in other parts of our study that it warrants inclusion in the definition. Organization Development is a long range effort.

> both organizational task accomplishment and human fulfillment, there is an organizational press in favor of the former. OD as a field runs the risk of encouraging and implementing subtle but persuasive forms of exploitation, curtailment of freedom, control of personality, violation of dignity, intrusion of privacy - all in the name of science and of economic and technological efficiency. Within the hierarchial fabric of everyday organizational power struggles, OD researcher/consultants typically represent the control needs of management. The needs of those lower in the organization for a higher quality of life, for an expanded range of occupational life choices may seldom be known or acted upon by the consultant."

Forbes (1977) lists the key words from definitions of OD (planned change, behavioral science, problem solving, etc.) and contrasts these with the reality of OD as he has experienced it:

> "I have found that many OD consultants, employed by members of management for use in their organizations, seem actually to function as re-stabilitizing agents rather than change agents. Their real purpose within the organization is not to foster growth and improvement but rather to restore a lost homeostatic balance." (Forbes, 1977:12)

He goes on to produce a contradictory set of key words:

> "protector of the status quo; reactive change; political and common sense knowledge, hurt reduction, organizational survivial, controlled from the middle..." (Forbes 1977:12)

Crockett (1978) makes essentially the same observation:

> "My impression is that all too often the goal of the intervention is the preservation of the status quo rather than bringing about the structural changes that are really needed by the organization. Since most organizational leaders think first that their problems are most functional than organic they tinker rather than make substantive changes...My second concern revolves around the motives of the organization in bringing OD aboard. To become involved in organizational changes in order to help the condition of people is at the heart of the OD ethic. But to become involved in a process whose covert objective is to manipulate people into a "happier state", or to gain greater productivity from them, bothers me." (p. 11-12).

Lundberg (1978) states the problem in more Marxian terms:

> "Most of OD's assumptions (rules of thumb?) would have us uncritically accept a capitalistic economic and political structure, uncritically adjust to economic and technological growth, and uncritically accept the importance of social class and the centrality of work in people's lives. Most OD "assumptions" blind theorizers to the differences and pluralism of organizations and the real, structural sources of conflict." (p. 9)

Bowers (1977: 53-57) describes more mundane but nonetheless real dilemmas in Organization Development - superficiality, commercialism and mistaken assumptions about the consultant's role. In particular, superficiality refers to short term, one-shot workshops, if they are not linked to ongoing activities of the organization, or if they only involve a few members of the organization. Superficiality also occurs when OD activities are preprogrammed and are experienced as artificial in relation to the real needs of the organization. In short, superficiality means that too few of the organization's resources are brought to bear on the real problems (Bowers, 1977:54). Commercialism includes such things as overadvocacy (making exaggerated claims about appropriateness and payoff) and consequent aversion to rigorous evaluation (Bowers, 1977:54); mistaken assumption about the consultants' role as a catalytic one of freeing up the "natural" capacity of the group rather than a linkage one which matches the needs of the group to a variety of outside resources (Bowers 1977:55-56).

Jones and Pfeiffer (1978) in a concise fashion list several similar problems about the use and misuse of OD which have contributed to its negative image - the inappropriate use of T-Groups with intact work groups, the confusion of team building with OD (the latter focussing on the organizaion as a whole), overemphasis on emotional issues over organizational problems, and the use of inappropriate methods and jargon which confuse participants.

Kahn (1974) also provides a description of many of the main putative problems of OD:

> "Organizational development is not a concept, at least not in the scientific sense of the word: it is not precisely defined; it is not reducible to specific uniform, observable behaviors; it does not have a prescribed and verifiable place in a network of logically related concepts, a theory." (Kahn, 1974:490)

Kahn cites several definitions and contends that they are "too inclusive to be helpful" (p. 490) and that when OD treatments are used we get only a sense of global packages rather than precise independent variables in relation to potential effects. In examining Franklin's (1973) bibliography of OD which contained 200 items Kahn concludes: "I have found no examples of sustained refinement of independent variables in the articles...although some beginnings have been made from time to time." (Kahn, 1974:492)

Lundberg (1978) agrees that one of the main sources of the problems of defining and working with OD relates to its poorly developed state of OD theory:

> "The term "theory" is variously used. "Theories" in OD are multiple and there is no general overarching one. The "theories" probably leave many gaps in our knowledge. These "theories" have been developed in several ways. These "theories" only begin to measure up to the canons of so-called rigorous science. These "theories" are more focussed on the "whats" rather than the "hows" of change." (p. 3)

To a large extent these problems probably reflect the poor state of "organizational theory" in general, but they seem particularly problematic for OD because of its ambiguous nature definitionally, and because it is applied to a variety of types of organizations (e.g. business and service). We return to the state of the art of OD theory in section IV of this review.

Derr (1976) in the 1976 Symposium on OD, after several years of practising OD in education and observing its use, concluded that OD may not be appropriate for schools. His argument is best summarized in Table One taken from his article:

TABLE 1
School Organization v. Organization Development

School Organization	OD Concept Violated
A. *Lack of Common Indicators of Performance*	A. *Readiness* –must feel a need for improvement –client system must sense its own problems in order to be committed to working them.
B. *Nature of School Environment* –survival guaranteed –public relations orientation –crisis orientation	B. *Improvement Orientation* –it is worth time, effort, $ to improve –must continuously learn from experience (self-renewal) –long-term effort
C. *Autonomy Needs of Employees*	C. *Collaborative Theory and Method*
D. *Low Required Interdependence* –don't have to work together –benefits of collaboration not greater than costs	D. *Systemic Orientation* –also, collaborative values and methods in OD –real incentives to stress opportunity costs of non-collaboration
E. *Civil Service Mentality* –some goal displacement: employment v. educational systems –job security conscious –inbreeding	E. *External and Internal Capability, Improvement Orientation* –must employ best internal OD specialists from whatever background –both external and internal OD specialists –roles and structure fluid and dynamic; choose best men or group for a given job –norms of risk taking and improvement should prevail
F. *Few Resources*	F. *Adequate Resources Necessary*

(from Derr, 1976:236)

Simply stated, the nature of school organizations is incompatible with the assumptions of OD, Derr concludes. But Miles (1976) challenged Derr's view, pointing out that (a) OD is not properly defined as "collaborative" necessarily, but simply the "sustained, reflexive use of behavioral-science-based efforts to improve a system's functioning", whether that functioning is "competitive, negotiative, low-interdependent or closely collaborative"; (b) personality variables such as "civil service mentality" are less relevant to OD diffusion than system-structural variables; (c) OD is as often entered for reasons such as perceived pain, injustice or system stress as for goal achievement failures as such; (d) "anatomy is not destiny" (in the sense that certain properties of schools doom OD to failure).

As Schmuck and Miles (1971) have pointed out, the special properties of schools "provide clearly-defined change goals and leverage points' for OD entry...OD can be effective and productive in schools, helping them correct or transcend problems they face because of their special systemic properties".[6]

In Volume One we have already outlined briefly these properties, as extracted from the literature: goal diffuseness, weak technical capability; coordination problems; boundary management difficulties; non-competitive status vis-a-vis other schools; embeddedness in a constrained, decentralized environment.

We will anticipate the empirical findings of our study (Vol. III) here briefly by reporting that (a) school districts do initiate OD because of goal achievement difficulties, coordination issues, and technical insufficiency or backwardness; (b) boundary management issues are less frequent as a start problem, and districts may require minimal environmental turbulence before launching successful OD; (c) the non-competitive, "guaranteed survival" aspect has less effect than might be expected, since most of our successful districts began with perceived educational and task-oriented organizational issues, along with projected structural changes; (d) OD was in fact slightly more successful when it occurred in a context of constrained (mandated) changes than when no such changes were present: (e) decentralization of school districts is probably a feature slowing or minimizing the diffusion of OD to, at present, less than 1% of districts. On balance, we conclude that the special properties of schools do not necessarily unfit them for adopting and implementing OD, and OD is not "inherently" a bad fit for schools as organizations.

Before attempting to reconcile the various viewpoints expressed in the past several pages, it is necessary to probe further by examining in more detail the question of the underlying values and assumptions of OD including observations about "values in practice". (We draw mainly on Alderfer, 1977; Bowen, 1977; Friedlander, 1976; Tichy, 1974, 1976a, 1976b; and Walton and Warrick, 1973.)

---

[6] Whether OD is effective or not depends on a whole host of factors we identify in Sections I, II and III of this review, that is depends on whether the approach to OD meets the definition, and takes into account the operating conditions necessary for its success.

Friedlander (1976) begins to explain the underlying dilemmas of OD by suggesting that three sometimes contradictory values form the essential basis of OD - rationalism, pragmatism and existentialism. Depending on the blend of these three values various precursors of OD were spawned: lab training, T-Groups, Survey Research, Action Research and Feedback, MBO and other Systems Perspectives, etc. (Friedlander, 1976: 8-16).[7] When the link between laboratory training and transfer to organizational setting was forged OD came into existence. Friedlander states that current tensions in OD can be traced to the uneasy combination of the three ancestral values:

> "Rationalism pushes contemporary OD toward becoming more scientific, more theoretical and conceptual, more logical and mathematical; toward abstract models, toward building theories; toward understanding the determinants of our organizational, social, and personal worlds. Pragmatism pushes OD in the direction of becoming more useful - how does OD increase effectiveness, performance, productivity... Existentialism within OD pushes the organization to become more humanistic, more aware, more emerging, more person growth oriented". (Friedlander, 1976:18).

The combination of these three ideal types results in divergent perspectives and tensions.

> "The rationalist's entry into the organization is with "prebuilt" concepts and models, and his interest in taking away knowledge to build better models makes him seem abstract as well as irrelevant, and unconcerned about the organization, its provlems and people...The pragmatists entry into the organization - with designs, exercises, planned interventions, training programs, and evaluation instruments - frequently seem like an irrelevant intrusion...The rationalist fears that the pragmatist will become the victim of "whatever works" - a technique, a fad, a method that has always been used - with little knowledge of how these fit into a larger organizational scheme. And the existentialist is sorely suspicious that "whatever works" may turn out to be a mechanistic manipulation of the person...In contrast, the existentialist mode of "getting with" people, their uses, and their experiences is seen by the pragmatist and rationalist as slow, irrelevant to the organization, overly loose, unproductive, and sometimes simply mystique or therapy". (Friedlander, 1976: 19-20)

---

[7] Note that all these precursors have a strong reflexive, self-analytic core: the emphasis is on inquiry, learning from experience, using data for planning change.

Friedlander claims that OD gets into trouble when it neglects one or more of the three values. If the rationalist part is neglected, OD fails to operate with a coherent, conceptual base, if the pragmatic part is ignored OD becomes distant and irrelevant; and if existential values are denied OD becomes depersonalized (p. 20-21). Improper blends of the three values, states Friedlander, accounts for OD being "frequently denounced for failures". (p. 21) (Recall also Bassin and Gross, 1978, who argued for the importance of pragmatic results.)

Alderfer (1977) also discusses the relationship between values and OD. The two main values of OD, according to Alderfer (1977:198) concern the desire to "humanize" organizations and to improve the "effectiveness" of organizations. Alderfer indicates that earlier uses of OD assumed that the two sets of values were compatible, but "as the field has grown, increasing numbers of questions have been raised about just how easy it is to pursue both kinds of values with approximately equal vigor". (p. 198) The problem of power lies at the heart of the issue: "OD professionals must struggle with whether their professional competence (power) is being used to advance humane values and with whether they can harness enough power to bring about desirable change in human organizations". (p. 199) The OD consultant must be sensitive to and deal explicitly with these essentially political processes. Failure to take account of the potential value conflicts and political processes can result in OD being used to dehumanize social processes rather than to humanize them. (p. 199)

As evidence for the reality of the problem Alderfer cites Tichy's research which we have referred to elsewhere (Tichy, 1974). Specifically, in a survey of change agents Tichy found that the actions of OD consultants as a group were incongruent with their espoused values and intentions - by and large they said that their goal was to promote individual freedom and power equalization, but in terms of their behavior they indicated that they actually worked to improve productivity and problem solving capacity of the organization (Tichy, 1974).

In an earlier article Walton and Warwick (1973) discussed in some detail the ethical dilemmas of OD as falling under three, now familiar headings - power, freedom, and professional responsibility.

Under power, the first question they raise concerns justice:

> "Is it fair that those who already possess power and control wealth have much more access in our society to the "social technology" of OD than do others" (Walton and Warwick, 1973:684; see also Fullan, 1976).

They suggest that even though most OD consultants claim that they are working for the entire organization, the fact that they are usually hired by management is far from inconsequential. They advocate that the consultants should be explicitly sensitive to those problem and should deal with power openly. (They then give several examples.)

Secondly, Walton and Warwick contend that OD sometimes implicitly violates the values of freedom (again see Fullan, 1976). If freedom involves awareness of options, knowledge of their consequences, and the ability to act upon them (and consequently freedom from coercion, manipulation and misuse of information) there are certain ethical dilemmas faced by OD consultants (Walton and Warwick, 1973: 688-689). In citing examples, the two authors raise these ethical problems: that dilemmas in "freedom of choice" are inadequately addressed, and that Argyris' practice evidences an identification with top management (pp. 561-562).

Given all the variations and emphases in the goals of OD and its underlying values one may be forgiven if he or she echoes Filmore's (1974) plea: "OD: No More Definitions Please", or views current thinking on OD as Weisbord characterizes it:

> "Depending upon whom you talk to and what you read you will learn that OD works, doesn't work, is extremely complex, scientific and mysterious, defies description, can't be evaluated, should always be evaluated, risks becoming professionalized, risks not becoming professionalized, doesn't really exist, once existed but is becoming extinct, is metamorphosing into something else which also works, doesn't work, is extremely complex, scientific and mysterious, defies description, etc., etc., etc." (Weisbord, 1977:2).

On the other hand, a careful reading of the definitions and value dilemmas contained in the preceding pages enables us to pinpoint some of the basic problems and to understand what OD is, and why it has come under so much attack. Three issues stand out: 1) OD is attacked because many uses of OD probably do not meet all the criteria (i.e., are not OD at all), 2) even when given OD programs theoretically meet the criteria there is often a descrepancy between the espoused values and the values in practice and 3) OD is intrinsically difficult because it involved balancing elements of the organization which are inherently in conflict or tension and are extremely complex to understand and work with. These three issues are discussed in turn.

First, if we return to our aggregate definition we can immediately rule out all these activities which address only parts of the organization or the problem (e.g., communications workshops) or which are in Bowers' term superficial:

> "From our observation, many employees have only the vaguest notion of what OD means at the time they agree to or are persuaded to participate, even after some discussion." (p. 689)

Or when a superior introduces the possibility of participating in an OD program which he or she supports, and which is "voluntary" it is "very difficult for a subordinate to imagine that there would be no penalty for declining to participate". (p. 690)

Other examples by Walton and Warwick show how promises of privacy and freedom can be violated through persuasion, pressure and manipulation.

Several ethical dilemmas concerning professional responsibility are also discussed by Walton and Warwick namely, competence or when the OD consultant "allows a client to expect more than can be delivered" (p.694), client over-dependency on the OD consultant or its opposite insufficient commitment by the OD consultant, consulting versus research, and violations of confidentiality (pp. 696-697).

The authors conclude by advocating greater self-analysis, dialogue and setting of ethical standards by OD consultants and practitioners.

Bowen (1977) also discusses the value dilemmas in OD identified above and advocates that the use of Argyris' primary task model (i.e., valid information, free choice, and internal commitment) would minimize the main value conflicts. However, the difficulties and elusiveness of coming to a resolution are evident in the same issue of the Journal of Applied Behavioral Science in an article by Van de Vliert (1977) entitled "Inconsistencies in the Argyris Intervention Theory". Van de Vliert argues among other things that dilemmas in "freedom of choice" are inadequately addressed, and that Argyris' practice evidences an identification with top management (pp. 561-562).

Given all the variations and emphases in the goals of OD and its underlying values one may be forgiven if he or she echoes Filmore's (1974) plea: "OD: No More Definitions Please", or views current thinking on OD as Weisbord characterizes it:

> "Depending upon whom you talk to and what you read you will learn that OD works, doesn't work, is extremely complex, scientific and mysterious, defies description, can't be evaluated, should always be evaluated, risks becoming professionalized, risks not becoming professionalized, doesn't really exist, once existed but is becoming extinct, is metamorphosing into something else which also works, doesn't work, is extremely complex, scientific and mysterious, defies description, etc., etc., etc. (Weisbord, 1977:2)

On the other hand, a careful reading of the definitions and value dilemmas contained in the preceding pages enables us to pinpoint some of the basic problems and to understand what OD is, and why it has come under so much attack. Three issues stand out: 1) OD is attacked because many uses of OD probably do not meet all the criteria (i.e., are not OD at all), 2) even when given OD programs theoretically meet the criteria there is often a discrepancy between the espoused values and the values in practice and 3) OD is intrinsically difficult because it involves balancing elements of the organization which are inherently in conflict or tension and are extremely complex to understand and work with. These three issues are discussed in turn.

First, if we return to our aggregate definition we can immediately rule out all these activities which address only parts of the organization or the problem (e.g., communications workshops) or which are in Bowers' term superficial (one-shot training of a small portion of the organization). OD in this sense has failed because many activities which go under the label of OD are not really OD at all. This has contributed to both a confusion about what OD is, and to a reputation that OD is irrelevant or inconsequential. The presence of "OD"-labelled activities which do not meet the general definition can also be seen as a kind of vulgarization stemming from users' eagerness to appear up-to-date, innovative, etc., along with unwillingness to expend the time and resources needed for serious effort.

Second, the values in practice or use in OD programs may not in fact address the human side of development with equal integrity as they address the organizational side despite the intentions of OD consultants. The various critiques of the underlying assumptions and values may be accurate concerning the practice and consequences of many OD efforts, even if these consequences are not intended (indeed, even if the espoused goals are opposite to the eventual consequences).

Third, since OD not only has to address, but also to balance a number of complex factors, individual and organization, process, task and structure, etc. - over a long period of time, it is understandable that OD has had uneven success, especially since most definitions of OD do not stress the problem of balance.

Even if those three concerns are met we still would not know if OD is successful and under what conditions (that is a task for sections II and III), but at least it helps us sort out legitimate from illegitimate uses of OD as a precondition for investigating the potential of OD. In conclusion, general definitions of OD mask the complexities, specific components and dilemmas involved in the use of OD. The implications of our discussion of the goals and values of OD are twofold - potential OD programs and consultants should be scrutinized and should scrutinize themselves to determine that each of the major components of OD are included in the OD effort;[8] and second, vigilance and verification are necessary to ensure that the value dilemmas in OD are constantly being checked and kept in balance and that each of the values of OD are actually being implemented in practice.

All of this is not to say that there is only one distinct form of OD. The underlying principles may be met in different ways or the same programs may suffer different fates depending on the characteristics of the settings in which it is used. In order to identify more specifically the different operating characteristics of OD programs and the varying conditions under which they work, we reviewed the literature which analyzed these characteristics.

---

[8] The major components of OD include both the various aspects listed on page 6 (i.e. planned change, problem solving, etc.) as well as the use of OD in a value congruent way discussed in the last several pages; see also Vol. V for a revised definition of OD based on our total study.

II OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS

The next two sections are closely related because we examine the nature and conditions of successful and unsuccessful OD in operation (section II) and then zero in on the question of success by considering explicitly the evidence on the actual impact of OD programs (section III). Section II identifies issues pertaining to using OD and some of the different OD approaches in operation, while section III analyses the impact of OD as a whole.

The considerations of operating characteristics consists of several types of issues - the nature or types of different OD approaches, conditions of entry and initiation of OD programs, and various operating issues such as the role of consultants, time investment and time line, types of people involved, and so on.

The review of operating characteristics of OD programs is organized into two broad sub-sections - case studies of OD programs in school districts, and comparative empirical reviews of OD in general.

Case Studies in School Districts

There are a number of recent case studies and write-ups of the operation of OD programs in schools which provide substantial data on the use of OD. Schmuck and Runkel's (1974, 1976) review of their own OD projects, Bassin and Gross (1978), Coad, Miskel and Van Meter, 1976, Cohen and Cadon (1978), Milstein (1977, 1978) and Mohrman et al (1977) are the main sources on which we draw.[9]

Without doubt, the most intensive and substantiated work on OD in schools has been carried out by Richard Schmuck, Philip Runkel and colleagues at the University of Oregon, who have been working with school districts since 1967 (see Schmuck et al, 1972, Schmuck et al, 1975, Schmuck et al 1977, Runkel and Schmuck, 1974, 1976). Fortunately, they have carried out their own review of research findings based on their work in a number of elementary and junior high schools as well as working on a district wide basis to establish and train internal cadres of OD specialists to serve all the schools in the district (for the latest overview of their work see Runkel and Schmuck, 1976).[10] An

---

[9] These case studies are the only write-ups we found on school district OD programs. Other studies such as Bartunek and Keys (1977) and Huguenin and Deal, 1977, focus on single schools within a district and are more in the nature of organizational training rather than OD - for example one or two training workshops constitute the entire OD intervention. The recent DTA project (1977) promises to provide in the near future additional well-documented case studies on the use of OD in schools.

[10] Although we enter this as one case, it is actually based on twenty case studies conducted by Schmuck, Runkel and their associates.

analysis of the research findings on their various OD programs enables us to identify an initial list of the conditions which they have found to be important for the operation of OD. They classify these in four categories - start-up, transition, maintenance and effects - all but the last will be summarized here (effects will be examined in section III). These four categories will also be used as the framework for reviewing the other case studies.

Entry or start-up is one of the main themes in the OD literature as we will see in nearly all of the case studies. It includes both the conditions or state of readiness for OD as well as the way in which OD is introduced. In summarizing several factors related to readiness the authors state:

> "Our evidence indicates that success in OD consultation in facilitating structural change is strongly influenced by the social-psychological readiness of the client organization to change. Readiness is greatest where openness of communication is valued and communication skill is high, where there is a widespread desire for collaborative work, where the administration is supportive or at least not negative toward the intervention, where there is a good agreement at the outset about the educational goals to be reached by restructuring, and where the staff does not have a history of one "innovation" after another that has failed to produce rewarding outcomes." (Runkel and Schmuck, 1976:13)

According to Runkel and Schmuck, a certain amount of organizational readiness is important as a precondition to whether OD will get started and/or be productive - a desire or value toward open communication and collaboration, administrative support, goal clarity and the absence of negative history of innovation.[11] In other places in their writings they emphasize that strong district support from central administrators is necessary, as well as the principal's commitment, support and involvement at the district level (see also Schmuck et al, 1975).

Two other factors which they list as essential are the need to focus on subsystems, and participation in the decision by all subsystem members:

> "The successes of OD consultation, we believe, are due in large measure to our insistence upon bringing entire subsystems into the consultation." Runkel and Schmuck, 1976)

---

[11] This finding, like that of Milstein's (1978) that more-troubled schools did not choose an offered OD program, is reminiscent of the finding that psychotherapy is most effective with persons of high ego strength, good verbal ability, etc. The usual cant is that "the people who need help the most don't take it". But this is too simple a version. Rather, it seems that reasonable resources and capabilities are needed to insure OD success: really weak, crisis-ridden or totally change-resistant districts simply do not have any extra resources to carry out an OD effort.

And:

> "It is of utmost importance to give adequate time for introducing what OD is and how it works to a potential client organization." (p. 13)
>
> "OD is more likely to help a school achieve a significant structural change when the staff's decision to move into innovation is public and almost consensual." (p. 17)

In their comparison of successful and unsuccessful experience in six elementary schools (Schmuck et al, 1975:356), they make the same point more specifically:

> "A crucial aspect of these early days, we are convinced, was the way group and individual decisions were made to participate in the project. We believe strongly that the total staff should hold at least three or four meetings over a period of about two months to discuss OD."

Under the category of "transition" Runkel and Schmuck include events during the initial use (e.g., the first year) of an OD program, the amount of consultation and time, use of consultants, continuity of leaders and the sequence and pacing of addressing norms and problems.

In working in relatively small or medium sized organizations (mostly elementary schools) Runkel and Schmuck have found that approximately 160 hours (about 27 days per staff based on Runkel and Schmuck's estimate of six hour days) of staff time in direct OD training and work over the period of a year is necessary for major results to occur. In fact, at the other end of the scale they found that "staffs receiving fewer than 24 hours (4 days) of OD help actually declined in their communicative adequacy." (p. 19) They cite some schools which evidenced positive changes after only 46 hours or even fewer, but caution that 24 hours or so is dangerously low because it opens problems which cannot be resolved in a short time. Thus, a single workshop or two or three workshops which total four days or less fit the latter time frame.

Recalling our earlier discussion of the definition of OD, Runkel and Bell comment on the dangers of superficial programs which use only a small number of hours (approximately 24 or less):

> "In practical terms, this result means that the isolated two day workshops that are only too common as laboratory training for organization development will probably have moderately destructive results." (Runkel and Bell, 1976: 132)

On the use of consultants - an issue we pursue throughout our study of OD - they claim:

> "consultation in OD is more likely to help a school modify its organizational structure when the staff makes frequent, knowledgeable, and proactive (not passive) use of outside consultants." (Runkel and Schmuck, 1976:19)

They also cite that continuity of the principal is important; in particular, that he or she stay with the organization until at least a year after the outside consultants leave.

The last aspect of the transitional period concerns sequence and pacing. For example, according to Runkel and Schmuck, constant communication, especially rapid feedback of diagnostic information on communication, is necessary as a basic condition for further development (pp. 20-21); and the sequence of change works best if it proceeds from communication and problem solving skills to structural and curricular changes (Runkel and Schmuck, 1976:21; Schmuck et al, 1975:362; but see our discussion of Bassin and Gross below for contrary suggestions under different conditions of readiness).

Concerning maintenance, Runkel and Schmuck make only one major observation - that maintenance of the OD program requires a team or cadre of inside organizational specialists who will operate as built-in subsystems of OD consultants. In their own work in some school districts they have built the program on the training of OD cadres within the district who operate in a staff relationship to the needs of the organization (see Runkel and Schmuck, 1976, but especially Schmuck et al, 1977: chapter 12).

Other case studies (mentioned above) of OD programs in school districts provide mostly supportive evidence but also suggest some additional factors and alternative designs. The Schmuck and Runkel review framework - start-up, transition or initial operation, and maintenance or longer term operation - is useful for analyzing these other studies.

Entry and Start-up

Several of the case studies throw new light on the question of organizational readiness. In a general commentary (i.e., not a case study), Derr and Demb (1974) essentially take the theoretical position that the conditions in urban school systems make it highly unlikely that OD will even be given a try. Pressing task and crises issues, financial pressures to use resources for more tangible needs (while OD is an unproven commodity), lack of required interdependence (no need for collaboration, or at least high subsystem autonomy does not require it), and general mistrust and skepticism that outside help and in particular OD help will be useful, all mitigate against the likely use of OD. If Derr and Demb are correct, Schmuck and Runkel's conditions for start-up - positive orientation to communication and collaboration,

support from administrators, beginning with process skills - do not exist in most city school districts. Conway, 1977, and Milstein, 1977, agree with Derr and Demb by suggesting that new approaches to OD are necessary which can work with educational organizations characterized by "adversarial relations" (i.e., as in contemporary urban education systems). Alternative approaches (to that of Schmuck and Runkel) in two of our case studies both identify and respond to the conditions in large cities (Bassin and Gross, 1978, and Milstein, 1977, 1978, Conway 1977, 1978).

Bassin and Gross (1978) have established what appears to be a fairly successful OD based renewal program for high schools in New York City. The entry issues which they raise show some similarities to those identified by Schmuck and Runkel, but also some essential differences.

The similarities both in terms of assumptions and evidence are that administrative support, especially by principals, is essential as is a focus on self-help, use of an outside and inside consultant, widespread participation, systematic planning, data gathering and action and so on (see Bassin and Gross 1978:6-10).

The main difference at the entry state (and in subsequent stages) concerns the emphasis on task and planning issues and on some definite short term results. They view entry (which is the first step in their seven step model) as one of convincing, preparing and negotiating with the principal and key staff members that their involvement will result in task specific work with at least some short term payoff without major financial costs. Further, this is formalized in specific terms:

> "The entry stage is completed by the joint development of a written Renewal design or outline." (p. 12)

They refer to their task/short term orientation as "practicality" - an assumption "which deviates from traditional OD practice."

> "Practicality - In order to success in the complex urban school setting Renewal must above all else be practical. People in schools simply have no tolerance for any approach for improvement which cannot produce tangible, practical results within a short time (6 months) and with a minimal money investment." (p. 10)

Bassin and Gross also indicate that two other assumptions and orientations vary from traditional OD. One is that an outside catalyst (not the OD consultant, but an outside the School district agency) can be important - in their case an organization of business people - the Economic Development Council (EDC) of New York City, but this may be peculiar to their situation in which they worked. The other factor which is not so unique concerns the emphasis on political skills of the OD consultant and training:

> "In addition to training people within the schools in the process of political skills itself, these consultants must have the ability to help negotiate with occasional opponents of the Renewal process and to help enlist the support of the administration to overcome opposition. Sometimes the Renewal process meets with opposition from the administration itself, in which case the consultant must serve as an effective mediator. Without effective management of political opposition the process is in jeopardy of dying." (p. 11)

Perhaps the other major differences which should be mentioned is that Bassin and Gross represent one of the few cases where students are directly involved in the OD program as trainees (but also see Schmuck, 1974).

The work of Milstein and colleagues in the city of Buffalo raises similar issues, many in the negative sense (i.e., factors which were not or could not be overcome at the entry stages). In May 1977, the Buffalo Public School District was awarded a Federal grant (ESEA Title IV-C) which they had applied for to facilitate the implementation of a court ordered desegregation program. The desegregation program involved re-assigning children to schools "so that all schools would reflect the approximate racial composition" of the entire district. The grant proposal was to establish and train an OD based internal district team of change agents (called the School Improvement Resources Team - SIRT) which would facilitate desegregation as well as work with other organizationally specific issues. The history of the start and entry of the project which is amply described by Milstein (1978:2-11) indicates a number of events or issues which inhibit successful entry.

First, Milstein discusses an issue to which we return throughout our study - not only the support or approval from central and building administrators, but their <u>active involvement</u> in the process:

> "The central office's support of SIRT, at the general level has been constant, but lack of involvement has meant, also, lack of sensitivity to the goals and processes employed. OD is not something that can be "explained", it must be experienced." (Milstein, 1978:5)

Several examples are cited as to the lack of understanding and involvement - just before the selection of SIRT members the central leaders made a decision to keep all central office personnel on duty throughout the summer which effectively prevented any central office personnel from being members of SIRT teams; three weeks before the training was to begin "central office planners <u>unilaterally</u> decided to establish small groups of administrators and teachers in each of nine schools that it felt would be most affected by the desegregation effort" (p. 10) and assigned these nine groups (called liaison teams) to be trained by SIRT in the summer.

The selection of SIRT members was also an important issue. The procedure used meant that the most "committed" not necessarily the most representative or respected members of district staff were selected (pp. 6-7).

Some of the evils of external grants (which we follow up in the section on maintenance) were evident from the start:

> "Buffalo's grant award was not made known until the beginning of May, 1977. Because training was slated to begin soon after school was dismissed for the summer, this required that the application and selection processes for the team would have to be fully designed and implemented in a period of one month. At the same time principals who might be interested in receiving the team's services at their schools would have to be notified and discussions would have to be carried on. SIRT was launched in an atmosphere of crisis; not an auspicious way to begin a project that emphasizes and attempts to model commitment, choice, long-range planning and control of one's destiny!" (Milstein, 1978:5)

In sum, several of the assumptions of entry and start-up seem to have been violated in the Buffalo case - lack of specific support and involvement of central and building administrators, excessively rapid start-up, inadequate communication and participation in decisions about the nature of the program, or even whether to do it at all, and we would add an assumption of our own - total reliance on external funds.

Cohen and Gadon's (1978) case study of a small size school system also provides support for the importance of specific forms of support for key administrators:

> "We were contacted by Acting Superintendent Mackey who initiated the project and became our internal change agent. His centrality in the system, reinforced by support of the School Board strongly contributed to the success of the project." (Cohen and Gadon, 1978:63)

They formulate a proposition in relation to the type of school district with which they worked:

> "If overall change is to take place in a highly hierarchial organization, the head of the organization must openly support the change goals." (p. 69)

Mohrman et al (1977) in a district-wide survey-feedback-action based on OD program corroborate several of the above findings in discussing the entry problems which they encountered including lukewarm central administrator support, lack of participation in deciding to initiate the

---

[12] There are some important similarities between Cohen and Gadon's case, and our own case study of Adams County (Case Study B in Vol. IV) which which was written without the knowledge of Cohen and Gadon's case. The main difference is that Cohen and Gadon's case deals only with administrators, while our case includes teachers and parents.

program (the decision was made by a central cabinet of administrators and principals), and a pre-history of wasted attempts at innovations in which administrators viewed the teachers as being interested in putting in as little time as possible, and teachers viewed administrators as having made decisions to start many new programs involving outside groups - programs which led to very little because the district office attached little importance to them in terms of follow-through. On top of all this the superintendent left the district before the program was started and "The interim superintendent agreed to cooperate but without enthusiasm" (p. 165). The one slight saving grace was that eventually the decision to participate was made on a school by school basis with the outside consultants presenting the information to the staff (nine of twenty-two schools in the district decided to participate). In effect, district wide involvement was impossible under the conditions of entry with future success depending on the initiative of a few principals and teachers in a context of minimal central support and understanding. Under these conditions even many of the nine schools who participated encountered several problems during implementation (see below).

Finally, conspicuous by its absence, is any discussion of entry conditions in the OD training program launched by Coad et al in four innercity schools. The training consisted of a two week preservice workshop in August for the staff of the four schools (the mornings were spent on OD (goal setting, communications, problem solving skills, etc.) and the afternoons on curriculum issues) and four interspersed day long sessions through the school year. There is little discussion of entry conditions or approaches other than the reference to the schools being "selected by administrators". The lack of impact, in fact the negative impact (see section III) may be traced to inadequate attention to entry and other operating characteristics reviewed in this section.

In any case, entry conditions and approaches are crucial to the subsequent fate of OD programs. We leave a summary of these conditions until the end of this section when we have reviewed all of the operating characteristics.

The issues of entry of course carry over into the initiation phase or the first year of operation and several new issues become important.

Transition (Initial operation)

In discussing transition or initiation it will be recalled that Runkel and Schmuck referred to amount of time, use of consultants, continuity of leaders and sequence and pacing of problems from initial skills training in communication and problem-solving to structural and task changes. These findings and others will be reviewed in the case studies.

Basin and Gross elaborate on the importance of focussing on task issues during the initial phases with training being built into rather than preceeding task work.

> "Schmuck and Runkel's model utilizes intensive training of school staff as an initial step...Renewal utilizes a planning sequence as the first major intervention in a school, and does training simultaneously as the planning cycle unfolds in the school...The reason Renewal began with actual problem-solving work rather than intensive training is the lack of tolerance and time among inner city school personnel for activities that do not generate immediate tangible results." (Bassin and Gross, 1978:3-4)

The tasks of renewal training range from specific issues (e.g. security, integration of 9th graders) to process skills. Although, Bassin and Gross emphasize the importance of focussing on specific tasks, it should be stated that their case examples do not indicate that educational tasks are a priority. Like Schmuck and Runkel, they indicate that "attention has turned to curriculum issues after the Renewal process has seemed reasonably secure". (p. 81) The task focus at the beginning is likely to be on highly specific organizational problems which affect the work life of the members of the school - security, relationship to custodial staff, etc. On the process/task balance it is worth noting in passing that one of the major initial problems in the massive Louisville OD program was reported to be the emphasis on interpersonal skills and relationships without linking these to specific curriculum and classroom needs (see Doll, Love and Levine, 1973:526).

Other operating factors identified by Bassin and Gross in general support Schmuck and Runkel's findings. They indicate that it is important to focus on entire subsystems or systems and that the school is the unit of change. For example, they work with four different levels or subsystems - the entire school, the administrative cabinet, student groups, and departments - all of these either independently or simultaneously. The conditions for success according to Bassin and Gross depend on the presence and fulfillment of key roles - the principal, an external to the school change agent (called the renewal consultant), an internal to the school change agent (called the renewal coordinator), a core coordinating and decision making group within the school, and the involvement of Heads of Departments, teachers, students and parents, and the corporate representatives from EDC. We do not have the space to describe all these roles. Suffice it to say that the importance of the principal relates to the specific support (provision of time, etc.) and the overseeing of communication and assignment of responsibilities. It is noteworthy that in the evaluation of implementation there were more cases of the principal playing a negative or non-supportive role rather than a supportive one:

> "Typically, the problem is that the principal is seen as failing to provide sufficient support to ensure the implementation of Renewal projects and plans." (p. 50)

On the other hand, there were some examples in which principals were seen as effective. In these cases, the principal "made time and sought out Renewal people to keep informed", "facilitated and initiated communication of Renewal activities to the faculty", provided time through regular faculty meetings or conference days, "provided a small piece of the schools' budget in the form of teacher time released" and "provided guidance in the development of feasible plans, approved plans and assured their implementation." (pp. 50-51)

The external consultant provides training and support to the principal and inside change agent and team with a view to having the inside group become independent of the external consultant, i.e., the emphasis is on establishing the internal capability of the school leaders and staff and avoiding dependence on the external consultant. Bassin and Gross also note that no school had an effective program if the internal coordinator was not effective in relating to all the various subgroups in the school and community. The role of the corporate representative is to provide an ongoing relationship to the business community and to help in obtaining additional external resources and funds.

The question of the amount of time necessary for renewal is also explicitly addressed by the authors:

> "Renewal is not a one-shot intervention but rather a sustained effort to help a school develop and improve its own problem solving capacity. The first cycle of Renewal movement through the stages of the model extend from entry to evaluation on a particular task takes anywhere from six months to a year. It usually takes two to three years to move Renewal beyond two levels within a school. The external Renewal consultant plans to stay with a school on an intensive (once per week basis) for two or three years and then move to a maintenance (as needed) relationship." (Bassin and Gross, 1978:26).

Regarding the time for people within the school, Renewal attempts to minimize the time demands. Bassin and Gross indicate that this means one to two periods a day for the coordinator (who gets released time), a meeting per week of the core groups, and an additional hour or two per week for committee meetings or workshops. In total, the time investment for the core group seem to be in the order of 60-90 hours. The rest of the staff is involved at various points during the year using professional development conference time, but the total time involved is unspecified. Most Renewal work is carried out during school time except for some of the work for core group members. Even with the emphasis on minimizing time demands the excessive expenditure of time was the most frequently cited problem by staff in implementing the program.

The nature of financial support for the program is another important feature of the use of OD. In the early years of the project (1974) each of the eight Renewal schools (at the time) received 3.5 positions for teacher released time and $10,000 - $20,000 per year for research and development. Funds came from the federal government (N.I.E.) and the New York Board. Currently, Renewal schools receive 1/5 to 1/2 of a position from the Board, and $500 from the EDC. There are two major issues here. One is that there has been a major shift toward minimizing external funds - the financial support from EDC is small. The individual school must support the program with only a small amount of support from the Board and from EDC. The second issue is that the minimal support does mean that it is difficult to involve very many staff for any given meeting or event.

This seems to be especially problematic because the program began with substantial external funds which have now been drastically cut. Bassin and Gross point out the problem of large amounts of external funds which inevitably must be cut:

> "Those people who are now about to embark on the Renewal process without external funding are likely to find it easier than those who had the funds, learned to use them productively, and then suffered the loss." (Bassin and Gross, 1978:47)

Most of the transitional problems discussed by Milstein follow from the entry and start-up issues identified in the previous section, so we need only refer to them here. By the end of the first week of its summer training the SIRT team had lost five of its sixteen members. Although the individual reasons seemed valid, the problem seemed partly due to the rapid start, overload of responsibilities, and in general the whole decision-making and support relationship between the central leaders and the SIRT program. Second, the rapidity and confusion of the start-up resulted in overdependence on the outside consultant who found himself doing specific designing for school based activities: "it also appears to have set a pattern of team dependency, requiring that I continue that role" (Milstein, 1978:15).

Other predictable problems of initiation followed during the transition phase. Milstein indicates that a major resocialization effort through personal contact is needed with individual members of central staff, if the problems of earlier lack of involvement and understanding are to have any chance of being reversed. After the intense activities of the summer, the program got off to a very slow start in the fall. Due to lack of involvement and understanding of the OD program by central and building administrators most desegregation related situations were not directed to the SIRT team, but handled in traditional crises terms; when SIRT members asked for release time they encountered flak from their principals (etc., etc.) (p. 17). On the other hand, SIRT has become invovled in three or four projects apparently as the result of the development of specific process skills learned in the summer training workshop. The overall effectiveness of the program will be examined in Section III when we take up the question of the impact of OD programs.

Cohen and Gadon in formulating propositions from their case study reinforce many of the findings we have been discussing - the importance of the consultant in relating equally to different subgroups; demoralized groups need early successes, if change is to be sustained; if system members perceive consultants as superior, it may lead to feelings of inadequacy and dependence. Cohen and Gadon, as did Bassin and Gross and Milstein (1977), suggest the use of political skills and power relationships may be necessary depending on the conditions existing in the system. Specifically, in their case study Cohen and Gadon state:

> "when there is much mistrust and suspicion among members of the client system, use of existing power relationships in the early days of the project can help to get the project started without permanent negative consequences." (p. 73)

However, power related decisions should be linked to subsequent participation, and to an understanding of the purpose and nature of the project. On the former, Cohen and Gadon advocate an explicit trial contract where some forms of initial involvement may be required with subsequent free choice after sufficient data is acquired by participants. Regarding the understanding of the project, unlike the case where top leadership approves or goes along with the project in general (as in Milstein), Cohen and Gadon indicate that it should be specific, especially if major organizational change is expected:

> "to alter leadership style from authoritarian to participative a manager is likely to need a conceptual model that clarifies the value of change behavior and the means to achieve it." (p. 75)

Mohrman et al (1977) also encountered predictable problems in the transitional period from entry into the first year of training. Since the problems of start-up were so severe and unresolved, resistance and skepticism by district administrators and staff affected the various training phases - the training/orientation of principals, of teacher leaders (in the nine schools who had opted to participate), the relation of principals to teacher leaders and school staff. Data on the implementation of the program (i.e., the degree to which staff members of the schools used the process model, etc.) corroborated the existence of uneven follow-through in using the program. Only four of the eight elementary schools employed the process guidance (the problem solving model) during the first year of implementation. During the second year, the one high school and one of the eight elementary schools dropped out of the program, while only three of the other seven schools actually implemented the program (Mohrman et al 1977:174). In the one school where the program worked best, the authors state that four factors were responsible: 1) the principal let the staff know that he was highly in favor of the program, and he reinforced their problem-solving efforts, 2) participation in program meetings was voluntary (the result was 100% attendance), 3) the school leader took special measure to communicate with and involve all staff and 4) the school was small (13 teachers) with no great divisiveness (Mohrman et al, 1977:180). The authors also add:

> "even when teachers were neither divided nor predisposed against the program, negative or uncertain attitudes of the principals led the faculties to doubt the legitimacy of the problem-solving groups" (p. 182).

As in the previously reported studies the respect and objectivity of the internal staff leader was important in the successful school - "highly respected" and "not identified with any particular subgroups" (p. 183). Again as before, this school began with a relatively simple specific problem before proceeding to more complex issues. There was the need for some initial "success" before the slower, more complex process of the complete problem-solving model could be entertained.

The role of finances is once again instructive. The program was supported by NIE with released time and other operating expenses of the program being more or less totally paid for by these external funds.

Apparently, school districts will go along with external OD programs which "pay the shot", but they won't have the commitment or understanding necessary to implement them.

The initial operating characteristics are not described in any detail by Coad et al (1976). The OD consultants met with each staff, described the program and asked for voluntary participation - 71% agreed to participate. Although participation was voluntary, it appears that the presence of the program in the particular four schools was designated by administrators wihtout consultation. The lack of participation by 29% of the staff may be connected to the initial entry strategy or lack of strategy and is one of the possible reasons for failure of the program (see section III) cited by the authors. There is no reference to the support or involvement of administrators. The authors also note that the eight external consultants did not operate as a team (they used their own particular appraoches rather than implementing the design). The program implementation as it turned out "may well have been a fragmented, less intensive experience for the four school faculties than was suggested by the earlier description of the program" (p. 13). We also find out that the four ad hoc day-long follow-up sessions during the year "may not have provided adequate time for any meaningful renewal of commitment, further development of skills or activities relating to the OD emphasis" (p. 13). In addition to the inadequate amount of time, this factor also indicates that the OD effort was not "sustained" during the period of implementation. Rather, the program operated in a series of discontinuous sessions. The lack of any internal change agents or consultants (at either the building or district level) and the lack of coordination at the district level points to the absence of other crucial operating factors which are crucial to both the transitional and institutionalization stages. Lastly, the costs of the program and source of funding are not explained other than a reference to it being "well financed" (p. 14) which implies that external funds were used (there is also a reference to Federal assistance).

Maintenance (or Institutionalization)

We have already implied the main issues concerning institutionalization of the OD programs in the school district case studies. Bassin and Gross claim that after four years some of the schools are moving toward maintenance:

> "The final step of Renewal is institutionalization, the ultimate goal of the Renewal process. Of the twelve schools in the sample for the Assessment, only three have institutionalized the Renewal process. Those three schools had all participated in the program for more than three years. Institutionalization was manifested by an effective recycling of entry and implementation, bolstered by all the other steps of the process. The fact that institutionalization of Renewal has occurred in at least three sites, while other schools are moving toward implementation is extremely hopeful." (Bassin and Gross, 1978:75)

As to strength of the OD program in the New York system, the authors indicate that thirty high schools are currently in the program and that there is a waiting list of schools to join, and this "despite the fact that Renewal for the past two years has brought virtually no additional monetary resources to the schools, and in fact, requires the principal to devote 1/5 of a teacher hour for a coordinator out of his/her own budget." (p. 92)

There are no data on the question of continuance in the Coad et al case. The description of the program and the negative results imply that it was a one year effort which did not continue.

To sum up our knowledge about the use of OD programs in school districts, based on the case studies just reviewed: entry is critical, it depends on strong specific support form top management; either a certain level of organizational readiness must exist, or the OD program must be designed/ presented in a way which convinces school people that it is task relevant, practical in the short run, and will not be unduly costly in time or money. On the other, Runkel and Schmuck provide strong and convincing evidence that a minimum time expenditure (upwards of four person days per staff) is important to warn people about. There must be some willingness to invest a certain amount of time and energy. Moreover, OD does cost some money, and programs which are totally dependent on outside money will likely not receive the commitment from the beginning. Some financial investment of the district and the schools (and here we are not talking about large sums) would seem to be an accurate indicator of potential success of the program. Decision-making about whether to become involved in an OD program is somewhat complicated. It appears that different routes as possible depending on the conditions. Ideally early participation by all administrators and staff is best. There is some evidence, however, that administrators and teachers could be involved in some pre-start OD activities as a precondition to decisions to participate which would be made at a later time during the early transition phase. Also, political skills and orientation to working with the the power relations in the setting is explicitly advocated by some authors (see also Beer, 1976).

During the transition or initial use, active involvement, support and understanding of the program by top management, and by principals are essential. When this was present (Runkel and Schmuck, several aspects of Bassin and Gross, Cohen and Gadon) the programs seem to get off to a good start. When it was absent (Milstein, Mohrman et al, Coad et al) the program experienced problems or went nowhere. Sustained training and work over the period of two years also seems to be necessary for implementing OD programs during the transition phase. The establishment and use of internal OD consultants (preferably with liaison or involvement responsibilities at the school level as well as at the level of coordinating the district effort) combined with proactive use of external consultants is also important. Programs which do not build this internal capacity, and/ or which build up a dependency on one or more external consultants are probably heading for trouble. Harvey (1975:4) and Weisbord (1977:6) also stress the point that the external OD consultant should not be viewed as or operate as a change agent. His or her job is to enhance the capabilities of internal managers and other personnel to make effective change decisions within their own organization - a claim which makes a great deal of sense and which is clearly supported in our case studies of successful OD programs (Volume IV).

Prospects for longer term institutionalization (e.g., after the first two years of activity) can be traced to the previous two phases. If active involvement of administrators, use of district funds (as opposed to total reliance on external funds) and development of internal consultant capabilities at the coordination and school levels have not been focusses of the entry and transition phases it is unlikely that the program will survive beyond the first two years or so.

Overviews and Comparative Reviews of OD

Although there are not any comprehensive empirical research reviews of OD in schools[14] (hence our own review), there have been a number of recent good overviews and comparative reviews of OD in general. Our intent is to review in this section the issues concerning the operating characteristics of OD and to suspend until section III the question of the assessment or impact of OD. The main overview type studies relevant to this review are Alderfer (1977), Bowers (1973, 1977), Bowers, Franklin and Pecorella (1976), Dunn and Swierczek (1977), Franklin (1976), Friedlander and Brown (1974), Margulies, Wright and Scholl (1977), Nielsen and Kimberly (1976), Pate, Nielsen and Bacon (1977) and Porras and Berg (1978).[15]

Friedlander and Brown (1974) in one of the earliest reviews of OD classify OD broadly as being directed at either the human processual aspects, or the techno-structural aspects of the organization. By and large our review leaves out the OD research on socio-technical systems per se (job design, job enlargement, job enrichment) because these techniques have not been used in schools as such (although we do include cases where structural and job changes are involved - Bassin and Gross, Schmuck et al, 1975). Friedlander and Brown (1974) list three different types of human processual approaches to OD - survey feedback, group development (team building) and intergroup development. They cite evidence that survey feedback by itself (without follow up and internal support) does not seem to lead to change and that collaborative involvement of participants and consultants with a focus on specific action steps are necessary. Team building examples of OD provided little data on the conditions of effective use, and even less on the impact of team building external to the group, i.e., on relationship to the rest of the organization. Similarly, there was limited data on the operating characteristics and impact of intergroup intervention.

Friedlander and Brown (1974) do summarize some of the first examples of comparative research in OD. For example, Bowers' (1973) comparison of the effects of four types of OD (survey feedback, interpersonal process consultation, task process consultation and laboratory training) and two control types (data handback and no treatment) in twenty-three organizations

---

[14] For a general overview of OD in education see Hayman (1977).

[15] Some of these studies, as can be inferred from the titles, are also relevant for the outcomes section.

is cited. Impact on various organizational aspects was assessed over time (criteria included impact on such aspects as communication, decision-making, leadership support, goal emphasis, peer relationship and satisfaction). The results indicated that Survey Feedback was associated with the greatest number of changes, interpersonal process consultation was also high on impact, task consultation was neutral, and laboratory training, no treatment and data handback were associated with a decline on most measures. These findings warrant three comments. First, most of the results are compatible with our earlier observations, e.g., laboratory training by itself can lead to negative impact. Second, although survey feedback can lead to positive impact we already know that this depends on a number of other operating characteristics we have already identified (the fact that Bowers results were positive is probably associated with the fact that all of the cases of Survey Feedback were carried out by Bowers and his colleagues, i.e., relatively homogeneous and presumably effective operating characteristics were in practice). We should also note that survey feedback as defined by Bowers includes careful problem solving efforts, supports and so on. Third, the neutral impact of the task approach is contradictory to other data we have presented (e.g., Bassin and Gross) who advocate the need for a task focus in schools. We are more inclined to agree with these other data because they are more recent (1978 is different than 1966 when Bowers commenced his project; currently there is a more urgent concern for task and short-term payoff at least in schools), applied to schools (business organizations and schools may differ), and are more specific (e.g., we know the operating characteristics of Bassin and Gross' model, but not of Bowers' task approach - the fact that Bowers is an advocate of Survey Feedback compounds the question of whether the task approach was as homogeneous, or was carried out as thoroughly as the Survey Feedback approach).[16] In a later review Bowers (1977:59-60) describes three cases of success, and summarizes their common themes - the companies made resources available, the program was integrated with existing roles and structure, the effort was carefully introduced, evaluation was emphasized, consultant style emphasized knowledge transmission and feedback data on performance, some degree of survey feedback was used, and in each case substantial improvements took two to three years to appear. All of these findings are quite consistent with our earlier review of school district case studies.

In classifying the themes and techniques of OD, Alderfer (1977) refers to five different approaches[17] - team building, survey feedback, structural

---

[16] Margulies et al (1977:438) makes a similar critique of the Bowers study - (1) lack of comparability between groups; (2) inadequate diagnostic process prior to the various interventions; (3) whether it was expected that lab training would improve the situation in the total organization, and (4) what the "total" situation was in each of the comparison groups.

[17] We should note that Alderfer's list, like many others describing OD strategies, mixes up the organizational foci of attention (e.g., teams and environmental interface) and the intervention mode (e.g., survey feedback, and structural approaches). Schmuck and Miles , 1971, have separated these, and added a third dimension (diagnosed problems, such as decision-making, role definition). The three dimensions can be displayed in an "OD cube" within which any particular OD strategy can be placed.

approaches, environmental interfaces (working across organizational boundaries) and cognitive development (focus on the cognitive orientation of the individuals within the organization).[18] He claims that OD is no longer concerned just with a small group and interpersonal processes, but with a wide range of organizational and environmental issues (Alderfer 1977:210). Forecasting some of the concerns we raise in section III, Alderfer states that few of the techniques have been evaluated.

Franklin (1976) in a further examination of the data from the same sample as that of Bowers represents one of the first examples of more specific analytical comparisons of OD in operation. He compares OD in 11 organizations which had successful OD programs with OD in 14 organizations which had unsuccessful programs. Success and unsuccess were based on changes in 16 survey indices (climate, practices, leadership behavior, satisfaction, etc.) Franklin was able to investigate eight different categories of operating characteristics , most of which are familiar and relevant to our review - 1) characteristics of the environment, 2) of the organization, 3) initial contact with outside consultant, 4) formal entry procedures, 5) data gathering activities, 6) characteristics of internal change agents, 7) external change agents, and 8) exit procedures. Most of the results corroborate our earlier review of case studies. The most applicable results: organizations with innovative reputations were more likely to fall in the successful group; prior contact with external consultants characterized the successful cases as did the expression of a specific problem rather than a general one, and a commitment to survey feedback; top managers extended greater support to the effort in successful cases; introduction of the program in successful cases was much more likely to be part of a total development effort rather than an add-on; successful organizations were not committed to more than 4 years of development work on the particular project; internal change agents in successful cases were more likely to have been carefully selected, but interestingly the quantity of previous change agent training was inversely related to success with the most successful ones being trained for the first time for the development effort at hand, and having assessment-prescriptive skills capability to diagnose and prescribe specific interventions; also change agents in the unsuccessful organizations were more likely to be members of personnel departments; no differences were found regarding the characteristics of external change agents; another puzzling finding was that pace, attitude of upper level managers toward project terminations and reasons for termination (on the basis of perceived project failure) did not vary between the successful and unsuccessful cases.

---

[18] Tichy's work (1974, 1976 a,b) on the cognitive orientation of consultants fits this approach.

In summarizing the main differences, Franklin states that three general areas seem to differentiate success from lack of success - growth or change in the environment, specific interests and commitment by top management, and careful selection of internal change agents who possess assessment-prescriptive skills (the latter factor (selection) and other possibilities likely account for the anomalous finding regarding previous training - see Franklin, 1976: 480-490 for additional discussion). These three sets of findings are compatible or not inconsistent with our previous results (although we have not looked at environment directly). The findings on termination remain a puzzle, but the particular variables we identified earlier were not directly measured (internal capability vs. dependence, role of finance). The finding on the skills of internal change agents as indicated by Franklin is consistent with Bowers, Franklin and Pecorella's (1975) analysis that interventions should be matched with problems, that is, techniques of intervention should vary depending on whether the main problem concerns information, skill or the structural factors.

Margulies, Wright and School (1977) continue the expansion of more sophisticated analytical comparisons of OD efforts. They reviewed the literature between 1964 and 1976 and classified thirty cases of six types of OD intervention - organizational sensitivity training (e.g., laboratory training), team building, survey feedback, job redesign, sociotechnical, and structural (the latter refers to changes in the management system) - which reported actual data on OD research results. At the outset, they remark the despite the hundred of reports on OD in the literature only 30 conformed to their criteria (research results, etc.)[19] We leave aside a close look at the impact of the six interventions until section III in order to consider first the findings on operating characteristics. First, they do not draw any firm conclusions about laboratory training because variations in operation are not known, and effects of other changes occuring at the same time (e.g., laboratory training as one of several changes) are unknowns. Their assessments of the most successful characteristics of team building programs sounds familiar:

> "(1) the need for a thorough diagnostic process to determine the appropriateness of using the team building technique (2) the need for voluntary and/or participative involvement in the decision to use team building...and (3) the need to establish in-house capability to sustain and support team-building efforts as the need arises" (p. 437)

Regarding survey feedback, Margulies et al conclude that the six studies they reviewed "cannot answer the question of what conditions survey feedback works best under or who benefits most from the intervention - the management or operatives" (p. 439) but that "survey feedback is a valuable starting point in the diagnostic process" (p. 439).

---

[19] Only one of the thirty cases involves schools (Schmuck and Runkel's work) reflecting the late development of OD in schools. As we have seen a few more cases in school districts have been carried out and written up since 1976.

As to the other three types of OD there are no new clear or applicable findings to our review.

Pate, Nielsen and Bacon (1977) conducted a similar comparative review of thirty-eight OD research studies (18 of the 30 Margulies et al studies are included in the Pate et al review). However, they used different comparison variables. Instead of comparing types of OD, they used more analytical categories relating to types of variables which characterized the studies. Eight dimensions were compared - longitudinal, extent of organizational involvement, nature of intervention (this is the variable used by Margulies et al, although the categories are not totally identical they do show considerable overlap), nature of independent variables, of dependent variables, referent measures, statistical analysis and research design. This study adds no new information other than to reinforce the conclusions that OD involves a variety of interventions, a variety of independent and dependent variables which are not clearly correlated empirically, the appropriateness and conditions under which the different interventions should be used is not known, and there is limited evaluative information on their impact with most of the data where it exists being based on questionnnaire reports.

In an award winning paper (1976 Douglas McGregor Award) Dunn and Swierczek (1977) have carried out one of the more complete reviews of case studies of organizational change efforts. They reiterate the charge that despite a large amount of research literature on organizatinal change, there does not exist much knowledge about the relationship between theory and practice. They used a grounded theory approach to do a content analysis of 67 case studies drawn from the literature on OD, sociotechnical design, participative management, etc. The sample was selected by stratifying cases on three dimensions. 1) type of organization (economic/service/commercial), 2)societal type (modern/modernizing) and 3) outcome (successful/unsuccessful). They ended up with 67 cases which met the criteria and contained adequate empirical data on the independent and dependent variables on which they proposed to test some leading hypotheses in the change literature. The twelve independent variables included such familiar items as type of organization, environment, change agent orientation, mode of intervention, etc. The two dependent variables were effectiveness (reported impact no matter who reported it, e.g., case writer, clients), and degree of adoption, (i.e., degree of institutionalization). They tested eleven well known hypotheses using cross-tabulations.

The upshot of their research was that only three of the eleven hypotheses received support, while several other prominent ones did not. If brief: results supported the hypotheses that 1) change efforts which are collaborative (between the change agent and client) are much more successful than those which are unilateral (change agent determines goals), delegative (delegated sub-group or organization determines goals) or subordinate (client determines goals) (Dunn and Swierczek, 1977:144), 2) related and seemingly overlapping with the previous variable, participative change agent orientation (involvement of the client in planning, diagnosing, etc) is moderately associated with effectiveness compared to non-participative orientations (expert or technical based), and 3) again seemingly overlapping, but nonetheless instructive, types of change efforts which were participative

namely, OD and Participative Management were more effective than non-participative ones (sociotechnical or socioorganizational design; in principle, these latter methods do not preclude participation).

Some of the main hypotheses which received little or no support - change efforts by internal change agents are no more successful than those from externals[20]; nor are stability of environment, type of organization (economic vs. service), or mixed versus focussed solutions (i.e., focussed = human, technological, structural or task; while mixed = a combination of two or more of the focussed ones) strongly associated with outcomes. The only one of these that is really out of line with our previous findings is mixed vs. focussed.[21] We would expect that efforts which simultaneously addressed the relationship between different parts of the organization would be more effective. As it turns out, the evidence was in the direction expected (mixed foci accounted for more successes) but was weak.

Dunn and Swierczek's research, as the authors themselves state, should be reviewed with considerable caution - variables are crudely measured, and the number of cases is small. The study does show promising lines of research, provides support for some of our previous findings, is not strongly incompatible with them, but all in all probably says more about the weaknesses of existing organizational theory and research (including OD, but also organizational theory as a whole) than anything else.

In the most recent review, Porras and Berg (1978) continue the assault on the inadequacies of OD research by analyzing 35 empirical OD studies in the period 1959 to mid 1975 including many of the ones contained in the two previous reviews. Pertaining to operating characteristics of OD several important findings are noted. First, 60% of the OD interventions were less than one year in duration (p. 165), while only 20% took place for more than two years - a revealing finding in light of the consensus that OD in organization takes more than two years to establish. A related finding was that the amount of time (number of days) in "official" OD activities by individual participants was similarly very small - 66%

---

[20] Note that this referred to either one change agent or the other - collaboration between insider consultants and outsiders was not measured, but may be partially inferred from the three other hypotheses which were supported.

[21] The change agent hypotheses is not a good test because it fails to measure combined insider/outsider forms, and thus does not even consider proactive use of outsiders by insiders; type of organization (economic vs. service) is not necessarily a good indicator if "perceived" success is the criterion, and in any case success probably depends more on the various operating characteristics (way in which the program has been introduced and implemented) rather than the type of organization. Finally, a close look at the stability of environment findings shows that effective cases are more likely to occur in long term stable and in short term unstable situation more so than under long term unstable, and short term stable conditions - a finding which makes sense.

reported involvement up to 10 days, 9% involved 11 to 20 days and the rest, 17%, was continuous or indeterminant (9% reported no data, p.165). Second, the OD research confirmed the commonly held belief that a disproportionate amount of OD work and data gathering occurs at the management or administrative levels of the organization - 91% of the studies report using managers as their data source (49% managerial level solely and 42% along with others) and only 9% focussed solely on non-managerial professionals (p. 160).[22] Third, the OD studies showed a heavy emphasis on working with the individual as the unit of analysis (58%) compared to small groups (22%) or larger organizational units (19%) - a finding which calls into question whether the programs actually meet the criteria of OD reviewed in Section I.[23] Fourth, an analysis of the types of intervention used and particularly changes over time are very instructive (p. 162). Regarding the former - 52% were based on laboratory training (two types were used - task and process lab training), 6% on counselling and 5% on cognitive training for a total of 63% (i.e. this group (63%) mostly focussed on the individual as the unit of change), while less than one third resembled organizationally based OD (15% Survey Feedback, 7% Structural Change, 1% Intergroup Relations, and 8% Process Consultation - the latter being ambiguous as to its focus).

Concerning changes over time, Porras and Berg compared the pre 1970 studies (N=15) with the post 1970 ones (N=20). Among the findings three stand out: first, most cases used more than one intervention technique - 2/3's report using two or more techniques, and the average number of techniques used has increased from 1.9 prior to 1970 to 2.8 post 1970 (p. 164).

Second, there has been a substantial increase in the use of Survey Feedback (from 20% pre 1970 to 45% of the post 1970 cases) and 2) task focussed lab training versus process focussed lab training has clearly increased:

> "Prior to 1970, 33% of the studies used process training and 27% used task training. Since then process training has dropped to 15% while task training has risen to 50%" (Porras and Berg, 1978:163).

The authors attribute the change to the lack of impact of process training and the relative efficacy of task focussed training.

Third, there has been a shift in working with larger units (small groups and organization (sub)systems) rather than individuals - before 1970, 73% of the studies focussed on the individual while after 1970 it dropped to 48%. Work with small groups and organizational units increased equally (that is, approximately equal proportions of the remaining 52% focus on small groups (28%) and organizational units (24%). Thus, the trend is encouraging in that it is moving in the direction of more authentic OD, but there remains a minority of OD projects which meet the various criteria we have reviewed in sections I and II.

---

[22] These exceptions came from service organizations (hospitals and schools). Our earlier review indicates that teachers are often the focus of OD in school districts.

[23] See also our comparison of types of OD approaches and their different impacts in our school district sample, Vol. III.

To conclude: the review of comparative reviews confirms that the state of theory and research in OD needs considerable more work; in particular, none of the reviews allowed us to test in a rigorous specific way the relationship among the various factors discussed in Sections I and II; there are some quite promising beginnings which have appeared in rapid succession in the past two or three years; these beginnings tend to provide support that OD is most effective when it includes support and specific involvement of top and lower level administrators, use of internal change agents using external resources in a proactive way, survey feedback and/or other organizationally focussed efforts rather than lab training or small group work, focus on specific problems rather than general ones and participative and collaborative modes of intervention; many formally classified OD efforts may not meet the criteria of "authentic OD" vis-a-vis our definitional discussion in section I (i.e., many focus on short-term lab or individual focussed training); a minority of OD efforts take place for more than two years (a time considered by many to be the minimum necessary for effectiveness and instutionalization)[24]; there seems to be a slight trend toward more sophisticated and authentic use of OD (that is, a closer congruence between the components of OD defined in section I and their presence as operating characteristics); lastly, the contribution of the findings in the reviews (based mainly in industrial organizations) to our knowledge of OD in schools is generally supportive or reinforcing, but not specifically helpful - few of the cases involved schools, and the detailed variables and their operation in the school based case studies which we reviewed earlier are not tested at a specific level, because the variables used in the reviews in this section were more crudely measured than would be necessary for such a test.

III. OUTCOMES

Most people consider questions about the real impact of OD on organizations and its members to be the most fundamental to its long term worth for social systems. Depending on one's values and interests these questions range from effects on human processes in organizations to member attitudes and satisfaction to organizational performance and productivity. We have touched on some of these issues in section II, but it is important to examine the effects of OD more fully and explicitly. As in the previous sections we first analyze the case studies in school systems, and then move to the larger comparative reviews to draw conclusions about the state of our knowledge of the results of OD.

---

[24] This is a research finding. It may be that many OD practitioners are involved in more sustained OD efforts, but are not oriented or do not take the time to write-up their results, while academically oriented external consultants are more likely to become engaged in shorter interventions and more likely to publish. Alderfer, 1977, comments on this gap between OD practice and OD research, and our own empirical study of OD in school districts (Vol. III) uncovered many instances of "hidden" sustained OD programs which had never been reported in professional journals.

Case Studies in School Districts

Runkel and Schmuck (1976) cite a wide range of effects on OD from the various projects (some 20 case studies in all) in which they have been involved:

> "Our research and the analyses of others indicate that OD methods (properly chosen, sequenced, and applied) can increase a school's spontaneous production of innovative social structures to meet internal and external challenges, improve the relationship between teachers and students, improve the responsiveness and creativity of staff, heighten the influence of the principal without reducing the influence of the staff (and vice-versa), expand the participation of teachers and students in the management of the school, and alter attitudes and other morale factors toward toward more harmonious and supportive expectations." (Runkel and Schmuck, 1976:23).

Among other examples they refer to one of their main projects which involved OD training for six elementary schools changing from a traditional structure of self-contained classrooms to differentiated staffing with a multiunit structure (see Schmuck et al, 1975). The results showed that three of the six schools were highly successful in developing and maintaining the organizational relationships and member satisfaction in the new multiunit structure.

Other findings summarized by Runkel and Schmuck are similar in that they report both supportive and unsupportive evidence (some successes and some failures or no change situations) concerning more effective collaboration among teachers, increased participation in curriculum planning, and in some cases "spill-over" effects on the relations between teachers and students. The latter is of special interest to us. In this regard the evidence is somewhat skimpy in that such effects were not measured in very many cases, their measurement sometimes depended on perceptions of teachers, and as stated before, examples of both success and lack of success were found.

All in all Runkel and Schmuck claim that the rate of success (which might be something around 50% in their opinion) is noteworthy "considering the large number of failures currently being reported in the literature". (p. 25)

An external assessment was conducted of Bassin and Gross' (1978) High School Renewal Project. Data were collected in a sample of twelve of the twenty-four schools active in the program in 1976. The evaluator measured both process and product type outcomes of the program. Bassin and Gross (1978:41) themselves indicate the major limitations in the evaluation: lack of quantitative summaries across schools, no pre-post evaluations or other quantitative data on student achievement, and data collection from only those in each school who were directly involved in the project (i.e., usually only a small minority of school members).

Bassin and Gross present the findings from the external evaluator in qualitative terms. First, the evaluator found that there was a diversity of definitions about what the Renewal Program was, although there was some agreement about some of the main goals (involving students, bringing in outside resources, involving teachers in planning, making communications more open). We take the diversity to mean a clear, underlying conception of the essential values and characteristics of the program (see Section I) had not been communicated to participants.[25] This meant that people would identify with one particular goal or another depending on the circumstances. If our earlier inference is correct that there must be a clear relationship between the underlying values and conception of OD, and its specific goals and operating characteristics in order to bring about a balanced and consistent OD effort, then the Renewal program is still at the initial stages. Stated another way, this consistency in bringing about changes in the conception of organizatinal members about their work and working relationships is one of the most difficult problems facing OD, and one of the keys to its long term success (see Sarason, 1972 for a particularly illuminating account of the role and importance of conceptions in bringing about organizational change). In assessing the degree of use of the seven step renewal model, the evaluator found that three of the twelve schools had institutionalized the process - not a bad rate of success given the early years of use in some of the schools and the extreme odds of establishing such a process in urban high schools in New York.

The project findings were also reported in qualitative terms - improved communication in "many of the schools", dramatic improvement in school security, development of more effective orientation strategies for incoming students, attention to curriculum changes, often followed more short-term specific changes:

> "In the schools assessed there were substantive modification in reading, mathematics, language, science, English, biology, chemistry, and other courses." (Bassin and Gross, 1978:81)

Ad hoc findings are also reported such as the program which increased the attendance of ninth graders in one mini-school by 20%.

When commenting on the significance of the changes the authors say:

> "Over the thirty schools, the significance of change varies from very substantial to nothing at all. However, both very great and nothing are extremes. In most schools there are changes that do effect hundreds of students. For the most part, the schools remain basically the same, with improvements interspersed throughout." (p. 87)

---

[25] The Bassin-Gross model has a very explicit seven-step conception of OD strategy, but it does not provide integrating concepts on the functioning of schools as organizations. The fact that the model encourages participants to work on specific programmatic projects rather than general organizational level issues may also account for the goal diversity noted.

In short, on the one hand we get a sense of productive development and expansion of the renewal program under the most adverse conditions of financial and social constraints. On the other hand, there is no quantitative data reported even for those individuals in the twelve schools who are directly involved in the program. We have a case of seeming success of OD-even the best possible success under the circumstances evident in New York High Schools - but we do not know for sure. We do know that when clearcut success does occur it depends on "the right match of variables" - strong support from the principals, a strong coordinator, an energetic core group, and no strong divisiveness between teachers and the administration (Bassin and Gross, 1978:88).

The OD program in Buffalo had completed almost one year of operation when Milstein and colleagues made their first report (Milstein, 1978). This program was also evaluated externally, although the evaluator (Conway) had worked with Milstein before on the same project and is in the same department (Conway, 1978). From the main evaluation we learn that team members of SIRT did improve their own internal group skill in paraphrasing, asking for ideas and information, etc., and there were several items which showed no definite improvement - asking for and relating feelings, risk taking/confronting, etc. (all of these based on observation of the group on selected days over the training period). (Conway, 1978)

The evaluator also made a subjective estimate on nine dimensions of the organizational health of the group at three points in time (dimensions included goal focus, communication, power equalization, problem solving, etc.). The vast majority of these dimensions at all three phases were estimated to be "well satisfied" (Conway, 1978: Appendix I). Conway makes an overall conclusion that "the SIRT group has attained a remarkable level of proficiency as an intervening group" (Appendix I). Milstein (1978) also indicates that SIRT performed well in training the liaison teams, the latter giving positive feedback to SIRT and the central office about the quality of the training.

But the conclusions we infer from reading the reports are much more tentative than those reached by Conway and Milstein. There are three issues involved - Did the group develop skills which they evidenced within the group? Did the group develop skills which they evidenced in their relationship to external groups. Did the group have an impact on the organizational performance of schools for whom they were intended (i.e., those facing desegregation problems). On the first question it seems that the group did develop such intragroup skills (see Conway, 1978), with the qualifier that the evidence is not totally positive or conclusive in that group members had high skills to begin with - it was difficult to distinguish clearly between initial skill level and later skill level. Second, we do not have any direct evidence that the skills were present in their relationship to external groups. There is some good indirect evidence that SIRT's work with the liaison teams was very satisfactory - liaison teams wanted to continue to expand the training - but no direct or quantitative evidence is presented by either author. Third, it is too early to tell whether there will be much of an impact on the schools in the district. Some schools will be following through with the program;

time and later evaluative data will be needed to answer the third question. In the meantime, the best we can say is that most SIRT group members probably have increased their own individual and group skills, but we do not know if they have been effective in transferring these skills in their work with school groups.[26]

Cohen and Gadon (1978) report that after two years of OD work, new management changes were "firmly entrenched" (p. 68). Evidence for this statement seems to come from the observation that new committees were operating regularly and dealing with key issues with which they have not previously dealt. Quantitative data are presented on the perceived (by administrators) accomplishment of 12 system goals comparing two points in time - September of the second year of the contract with April of the second year. These results show gains (of one-half a point or more on a seven point scale) for three of the twelve goals, losses on one item and virtually identical scores on the other eight goals, (Cohen and Gadon, 1978: Table 2, p. 67). So the accomplishments are not great based on the data presented.

We have already reported the relevant data (section II) from the final school based case study (Mohrman et al, 1977). If we take the 7 of the 9 schools who proceeded to the second year of the program we find that the seven stage process model was in use in three of the seven schools, and feedback sessions were conducted in four of the seven schools. What these data tell us is that the program was <u>implemented</u> in three or four schools. They do not indicate the <u>effects</u> of this implementation on either member satisfaction, or on any kind of organizational performance criteria (save for a few comments on one of the elementary schools and one of the subgroups within a high school, p. 176-177). At best we can say that some behavioral changes might have occurred in three or four of the schools (which might not be a bad record given the history of the start-up of the project).

Coad, Miskel and Van Meter (1976), measured the impact of their OD program on satisfaction, group process, climate, leadership and even on student achievement using a control group for comparison. Ironically, on almost every measure the control group scored higher than the trainee group - on many measures both groups declined, but the trainee group declined at a greater rate. As we have seen in previous sections, probable explanations for the failure to produce desired outcomes are related to the absence of necessary entry and operating conditions. It is doubtful whether the program meets our definition of OD (see the earlier discussion of the Coad et al case), and the negative findings provide support for Runkel and Bell's (1976) contention that a little OD is a dangerous thing - it can be harmful.

---

[26] The causes of effective and ineffective impact, of course, would not only depend on the quality of training, but on the whole host of operating factors which pertain to how the program was introduced and launched (see section II). In another study, Beurgenthal and Milstein (1977) claim that OD relevant training can be a factor leading to changes in the attitudes and skills of individuals who have received the training. How this training is used depends on all kinds of other factors which are not included in their study. We agree with Derr (1976) that the distinction between OT (organizational training) and OD is important. Many forms of training which are labelled OD are simply not OD as formulated in section I.

Overviews and Comparative Reviews of OD

The consensus of every overview and comparative analysis of the impact of OD is unequivocal in decrying the unavailability and the low quality of research and knowledge about the effects of OD programs (see all of the comparative references in section II). We will briefly review these sources in order to clarify the main issues.

In 1974 Friedlander and Brown concluded a review of the human processual approaches by saying that "there is little evidence...that organizational processes actually change, or that performance or effectiveness is increased." (p. 335) In one of the latest reviews, Alderfer (1977) indicates that evaluation studies in OD are becoming increasingly more rigorous and sophisticated, although OD research still seems to lag behind OD practice, i.e., a great deal of OD practice is occurring which is not being evaluated and reported in the literature.

Bowers (1973) as indicated previously, found that survey feedback (contrasted with other forms of OD) had significant impact on 16 indices of organizational climate (communication flow, influence, goal emphasis, support, satisfaction, etc.). Pre-test data collected before the intervention were compared with post-test data gathered one year after the intervention. Statistically significant post-test gains were found for nearly all sixteen dimensions. Methodological limitations with such a design are discussed below, but the evidence of change is more impressive than in most studies, especially given the fact the OD programs in several organizations were involved. We should also remember that any success probably depended on the sophisticated and consistent implementation of the "operating characteristics" of the particular Survey Feedback Model developed by Bower and his colleagues.[27]

In examining the same data, but including all four types of OD treatments (survey feedback, process consultation, task consultation, laboratory training) Franklin (1976) concluded that 11 of the organizations could be characterized as having undergone successful change (based on the 16 dimensions) and 14 classified as unsuccessful.[28] Taking Bowers and Franklin together, the type of treatment is not clearly separated or analyzed in comparison with the operating variables examined by Franklin (i.e., entry, support of top management, etc. - see section II), but we can infer that the successes were not quite as frequent as the unsuccesses (44% versus 56%), and when they did occur they were more likely to be associated with survey feedback approaches.

Margulies, Wright and School (1977) focus directly on the question of the "impact of change" of OD techniques. Their general review of the

---

[27] But see Golembiewski et al (1976:139) discussion of possible major methodological flaws in interpreting Bowers' results.

[28] For some unknown reason Franklin's sample included 25 cases rather than the 23 reported by Bowers.

literature led to the conclusion that "although there is an abundance of literature on OD, there is very little research on its effects that can withstand the rigorous testing most social scientists would expect". They found only 30 case studies which reported empirical results. In a general sense the data presented by Margulies et al (1977: Table 2, 433-434) show that twenty of the cases could be characterized as successful, eight as no change or mixed results, and two as producing negative results (our calculations based on their table). Only one of the twenty cases involves schools, the measures of impact are crude, and one always wonders whether failures are reported in the literature as faithfully as successes (see Mirvis and Berg, 1977). The authors themselves draw three main conclusions from their analysis. First, there are such inherent difficulties in measuring change that the validity of findings is questionable (e.g., change may be an artifact of the method of measurement - a point which we take up below); also, most of the OD research projects were of such a short time duration that their true longer term impact cannot be traced: "Little effort was spent in studying the long term effects of the interventions. It is doubtful, from the evidence available, whether any change reported was sustained" (p. 433). Second, where changes were reported, it was questionable whether they could be attributed to the OD intervention, since other events not controlled for could have caused the change; further, most of the interventions were multifaceted so that it is difficult to determine which variable actually caused the change. Third, the authors question whether the changes that do occur (e.g., in climate and other processes) actually have an impact on the organization's effectiveness, such as the goals of the organization, whether costs justify the changes, and whether impact lasts over time (p. 444).

Margulies et al make two types of recommendations - one that organizations engaged in OD should support and insist on well-planned research and evaluation of theimpact of programs, and two, that OD practitioners and consultants take greater care to design, conduct and report research on OD programs. Their characterization of the importance of such research conveys the futility of much of the current debate on the worth of OD:

> "Until the positive effects and the negative costs of OD interventions are substantiated the outcomes will remain at the level of speculation and theory and will be exaggereated by the proponents of either position." (Margulies et al, 1977:444)

Pate, Nielsen and Bacon (1977) also show that "the number of reported attempts to conduct systematic research on the impact of effectiveness of OD has been appallingly slim"(p. 449). For example, all 37 case studies in their sample used some form of attitude or perception questionnaire and 18 and the 37 did not employ any other data collection method (other than questionnaires). Attendant problems included lack of information on reliability or validity, and measurement error associated with questionnaire methods. They recommend the use of multi-methods with time-series research designs planned prior to the OD intervention. The authors do not provide any data which would enable us to calculate the nature or proportion of successes versus failures.

Dunn and Swierczek's (1977) sample of 67 successful and unsuccessful change efforts shows essentially the same problem - effectiveness could not be determined except "on the basis of the point of view of perceivers - who might sponsor, external evaluators, or change agents themselves." (p. 141). "Success" was defined as both (1) scoring in the top two categories of a four point "effectiveness scale" based on judgements of researchers, sponsors or users, and (2) as including adaptation or institutionalization of changes (not just installation or rejection). Based on this measure, 87% of the (18) OD programs were classified as successful, 100% of the Participative Management programs were successful (p. 148), while the other three types of change programs - Sociotechnical design, Socioorganizational design, and Institution Building, were lower in success rates, averaging 61% (the average rate for the total sample seems to be 75% successful/25% unsuccessful). Thus there is a definite support in favor of CD type programs, but there are more unanswered than answered questions - what is the exact nature of the OD programs in operation? (we have seen that the operating characteristics can vary widely), what was the scope of impact? (are we referring to varying size of subgroups and proportion of the organization), and how reliable and valid is the measure of success? (half of which is based on subjective measures often obtained from the sponsor or consultant of the program).

Porras and Berg (1978) provide further evidence of the problematic quality of OD evaluations, with some indication of improvement over time (post-1970 compared to pre-1970). All 35 studies in their sample collected data through questionnaires (57% used only questionnaires) and non-questionnaire behavioral data were seldom collected or quantified when they were referred to - the only other main type of data were based on company performance records (pp. 158-9). On the other hand, a majority of the studies used quasi-experimental designs, and relatively complex statistical methods of analysis (analysis of variance, correlations, regression) both of which have increased in use since 1970. The authors applaud the trend and suggest further development should include the use of multiple measurement approaches (especially, going beyond the use of only questionnaires), longer time frames, and more multivariate data analysis procedures (pp. 170-171). The authors analyzed the case studies in terms of their research design and evaluation methodological properties. They did not calculate or provide data on the nature of impact, or on proportion of successful efforts.

Any faith that one might have in relying solely on questionnaire data should be eliminated through a careful reading of the methodological issues raised by Golembiewski and others (Golembiewski and Munzenrider, 1975, Golembiewski, Billingsley and Yeager 1976; see also Nielsen and Kimberly 1976, Kimberly and Nielsen, 1976 and Ross and Deal, 1977).

Golembiewski and Munzenrider (1975) use "Likert's Profile of Organizational Characteristics" (which could generalize to many instruments measuring organizational climate) to show that variations in "Social Desirability" influenced how people respond to questionnaires about their organizations. People high on "social desirability" will respond in terms of what is socially acceptable rather than what exists, thereby confounding the validity of the measure and the meaning of the impact data from before/after research designs.

Even more problematic is Golembiewski et al's (1976) convincing contention that there are at least three types of change in relation to organizational climate, or any data based on perceptions. They refer to the three types of changes as alpha, beta or gamma change. Alpha change refers to a true change in the existential state of the organization comparing two points in time. Beta change involve some existential change, but is complicated by the fact that the respondent's perception of the meaning of the points on the scale (and the distance between interval points) has changed possibly as a result of the OD intervention. For example, initial (pre-intervention) reports of "the degree of participation in decisions" as high may show downward trends after the OD intervention which might change the cultural conception of the meaning of participation. Stated another way, a downward change in reported participation may be caused by one of two quite opposite possibilities (Golembiewski et al, 1976: 136-137). The downward change may be caused by an objectively real decrease (alpha change) - in this case the intervention has <u>failed</u>. On the other hand, the same data showing a downward change may result from a more accurate perception of the respondent of the meaning (of the scale) and actual level of participation in the organization. The respondent comes to know more about the meaning and criteria of participation and utilizes a more strict criterion for interpreting the level of participation (the conceptual meaning of the distance between intervals "stretches"). In this case the intervention may have <u>succeeded</u> in that that respondent has a more realistic description for subsequent action (and indeed the level of actual participation could have increased even though a comparison of the scores would show a decrease). In any case, the apparent decrease in scores is a result of change in the <u>interpretation of the meaning</u> of the scale rather than <u>actual changes</u> in the organization[29]. Gamma change which does not centrally concern us in this review (not because it is unimportant, but because there is no way of assessing it in the studies reviewed) involved a quantum change in redefining the most important variables to the extent that completely new dimensions (outcomes) have occurred which were not included in the pre-test because they were not contemplated or known at the early stage (and may remain unknown, if they are not detected). Thus, gamma changes are "off the scale" or more precisely would necessitate entirely different scales.

The distinction between alpha and beta changes is extremely important because seeming successes may be actually failures, and seeming failures or no change situations may be successes. One potential indicator of the latter may occur when interviews indicate that change has occurred, but questionnaire data show no change.[30] Goliembiewski gives one example of this possibility (p. 138). Ross and Deal (1977) discuss it at more length when they found a discrepancy between questionnaire and interview data - the former showed that no change had occurred while the latter

---

[29] This problem is not unique to OD studies, of course, but applies to any planned change or treatment process. Most investigators have preferred to avoid the issue and maintain the illusion of standard scales and standard respondents.

[30] Of course, the questionnaire data may be more accurate in any given case, but the point is that we do not know, and knowing is essential to interpreting validly whether or not the program has had an impact.

indicated that there was a change. In fact, Ross and Deal complicate the issue even further by offering four alternative interpretations to the same results. One relates to Golembiewski's types of change, by indicating that no change on the questionnaire may mean beta changes (the meaning of the scale changed so that no changes showed up when in reality there were changes as indicated by the interviews).[31]

The recommendations of our review authors cited above for more multi-method data gathering attempts to address the limitations of relying solely on questionnaire data. Porras and Berg state it succinctly:

> "We recommend a strong shift toward the use of interviews, quantified process observations, unobtrusive measures, and phenomenological approaches to supplement (not replace) the questionnaire method of data collection." (pp. 170-171)

Nielsen and Kimberly (1976) incorporate many of the issues about the effects of OD by suggesting five criteria for designing an effective assessment approach. 1) identifying the kinds of information available, and the skills necessary to analyze it, 2) deciding what to assess (defining the precise impacts expected), 3) measuring the consequences, 4) using time series data collection (i.e., data collection appropriate to OD), and 5) making explicit the cause/effect assumptions - what is the specific change(s) and specific outcome expected. In general, they urge that assessment and feedback should be established as an integral part of all OD designs (i.e., involve the participants in the design and use of assessment data).

We might summarize this section on impact as follows. First, the probability that any given OD program, in or out of schools, will be "successful" is perhaps .5 or less. Failures are as likely as successes.[32]

But this conclusion must be qualified in several ways. First, not a few OD programs that have been studied appear to have been ineptly conducted; they focussed on individual training rather than OD, they dealt with superficial issues, they lacked a coherent model, or they did not match interventions to diagnosed problems. Excluding these studies would improve success rates, of course, but the fact is that any domain of professional practice must in part be judged by how well the average or typical practitioner does.

---

[31] The other possible interpretations concern methodological shortcomings, the process as a garbage can (people participate in cycles and discard it as soon as the pressure passes), and the process as a myth because of loose-coupling of schools (the myth is maintained that participation has increased or is good, but in reality nothing has changed).

[32] The conventional wisdom on the effects of psychotherapy, a planned-change intervention with a much more focussed and limited client system than OD is that about one third of patients get better. A recent study (Smith and Glass, 1977) concluded after examining 400 studies of psychotherapy that the average client is moved from the 50th to the 75th percentile as a result of therapy.

Second, many studies of OD have had methodological weaknesses, including measurement errors and artifacts, over-reliance on questionnaires, lack of adequate controls, and failure to follow the program for a sustained period. Here it is less clear what the efrects on success rates are: it is entirely possible that requiring more research stringency would reduce the proportions of OD programs found to be successful. So we must be cautious about making large claims for OD, in or out of schools.

We should also note that even where success was claimed (or even reasonably well validated), it appears difficult to make precise explanatory statements of obtained results. This is in part because OD's underlying theory is not particularly crisp, in part because of the inherent complexity of studying organizational intervention, and in part because clear process measures, capable of being linked to outcome, were often absent.

Knowledge about OD cumulates slowly. Any given project takes at least two to three years;[33] the N of any given project is for practical purposes 1; the complexity of organizations and the object of study and the diverse state of present organization theory retards the development of good OD theory. It seems likely that OD practice in some respects is more sophisticated and competent than what has been written about it. But this is speculation, not well supported.

The assessment of OD's impact in schools as such suffers from all the problems outlined above. Schools also have an extra problem: their "bottom line" outcomes are supposedly those of imporved cognitive, attitudinal and behavioral outcomes in students. But (a) these goals are often diffuse, general and measurable with difficulty (see also Milstein, 1976 for a discussion of the difficulties of school based measurement); (b) students are often not directly involved in OD programs as participants, but are expected to benefit somehow in a "trickle-down" fashion from human-system or educational programmatic changes introduced among and by the adults of the system. Student benefits certainly need not be the only justification for OD's value in schools - adults in schools have a legitimate claim for a better quality of their working lives - but they cannot be ignored as a criterion of OD's success in schools. So far, impact of this sort has been less frequently reported than impact on adults. And, as with OD in other settings, the explanation of outcomes is weak. We might speculate that coordination problems and "loose coupling" in schools make it even more difficult to link programs to outcomes. Nonetheless, it is possible to gather more direct evaluation information on the operation of OD programs in schools and on reported outcomes, especially if multiple methods of data gathering are used. Until this kind of information is more available, the question of the future of OD in schools will remain largely unanswerable.

---

[33] We speculate that publication pressures have lead some academic researchers to move into print more rapidly than this: hence the presence of partial or incomplete cases, and the infrequency of longer-term studies of sustained OD.

IV THE FUTURE OF OD

What can we say about the future of OD, especially its future in schools? What are the current and likely future trends in OD?

Some people have concluded that OD in schools has no future, or is in such a weak state that it is bound to die off in the harsh environmental conditions of the foreseeable future. Derr (1976) states that the OD movement in education "has come and gone" like so many other administrative fads. Because of the limitations of the use of OD in schools (narrowly defined training in group and human relations, limited attention to structural changes) Deal and Derr (1977:11) refer to the OD in schools movement as "almost a past-tense phenomenon". Both Derr (1976) and Blumberg (1976) suggest that OD probably doesn't have a future in schools because a) it has been misapplied, b) some of the assumptions of OD (interdependence, collaboration, indicators of performance, etc.) simply do not apply in schools (as we have suggested earlier, the latter assumptions are debatable). Such critics believe that there is limited need or perception of need on the part of a good many administrators and teachers and c) current economic and environmental conditions in schools make it unlikely that something as amporhous, long term, unproven and as removed from direct student achievement as OD will be even tried, let alone tried with the time, energy and commitment necessary for it to work.

Various reviews in sections I to III also have suggested that the future of OD, more generally, is dubious due to several powerful factors:

(1) the lack of a real theory of OD (Lundberg, 1978, etc.)
(2) unclear goals and the lack of a coherent and comprehensive conception of just what constitutes OD (Kahn, 1974, Weisbord, 1977, etc.)
(3) fundamental dilemmas and discrepancies among the values and assumptions of OD, and between the espoused values and actual practices and their consequences (Bowen, 1977, Friedlander, 1976, and Friedlander and Brown, 1974).
(4) superficial and partial uses of OD (Bowers, 1977, etc.)
(5) using OD without proper diagnosis, entry, start-up procedures, time frames, and other operating characteristics necessary to be addressed in introducing and using OD (see all of section II).
(6) lack of attention to research and evaluation of OD attempts which could substantiate some of its claims (see section III).
(7) Partially consequent to (6), limited documented diffusion of OD programs and results. In general, the problem can be characterized as the predominance of diffuse OD practice with limited or unknown rigor and limited exchange of information about the experience of OD.[34]

---

[34] It could be pointed out that though these conditions apply to OD in general, the practice of OD shows little sign of declining, and in fact has increased over the past decade. Though this maintenance and expansion is in part a function of the creation of an OD-supportive "profession", we might also infer that organizations using OD do find it helpful in many respects, in spite of its scientific and intellectual disorderliness.
We should also note that the great bulk of this criticism comes from "the internal left" - that is, from OD consultants themselves. We detect few instances of criticism charging that OD is a "menace", a situation quite different from that involving T-Groups, encounter groups, and the range of treatments created in the "human potential" movement. There has always been plentiful criticism from both right and left of what has gone on in intensive group settings. Although OD may not be a "menace", we have noted that it may be a "pacifier", depending on how it is used, and as such operate as a conservative force favoring the status quo in organizations (see section I).

In our view the problems are not intrinsic ones (though they still could be fatal), that is, there is nothing intrinsic to the values or assumptions of OD which would make it inapplicable to modern organizations including schools. There are specific properties of schools which we discuss elsewhere in this review and in other parts of the study, but they more specify the conditions to be addressed, rather than pointing to intrinsic problems. Miles (1976) and ever Derr (1976) and Blumberg (1976) indicate that the concepts of authentic OD are not only compatible, but potentially extremely valuable for schools.

The main issues seem to revolve more around historical and practical factors. It is possible that narrow and ineffective applications of OD have created a reputation among school people which is impossible to overcome.[35] This reputation coupled with more stringent and adverse environmental conditions in schools with the press for more short-term direct survival help create a situation in which most school people will no longer turn to OD for help.

At the same time, increasingly sophisticated versions of OD in schools have been developed and used (e.g., Schmuck and Runkel, 1976; Bassin and Goss, 1978), but the examples of problematic use remain at least equally prevalent (e.g. Mohrman et al, 1977, Milstein, 1978). A close look at these and other programs shows that models of OD being used are indeed more comprehensive (less narrow) than previous versions, and that problems encountered are more at the level of entry and operation (section II) rather than at the level of definition and goals (section I, although the latter remains an important problem).

The comparative empirical reviews of OD also indicate increasing rigor in the nature and use of OD (section II). The problems still outweigh the progress, but there is a definite trend toward more comprehensive programs (use of multimethods of intervention, going beyond lab training, use of more sophisticated research and evaluation designs). Good - and well documented - uses of OD probably remain in the minority but the trend is there.

By and large the main implication for what should be done in future uses of OD is to distinguish between real OD and partial or non-OD. Authentic OD according to our review in Section I consists of coherent, systematic long-range, reflexively-oriented planned change programs to improve both organizational performance and the quality of life of individuals and groups within the organization, focussing on human processes, technostructural factors, and tasks in the organization using behavioral science concepts and methods, usually with the assistance of internal and external change agents, with the emphasis on the transfer and development of the capabilities of internal change agents and other organizational members. Balanced and equal attention to all factors is essential as is

---

[35]While this may be occurring in some regions or instances of use, our general impression is that most school personnel have a vague and incomplete impression of what OD is like and what it might do for them. That impression probably arises both from poorly-conceptualized and executed programs, and from weak, undeveloped channels of dissemination about OD's processes and effects in schools.

the actual implementation of espoused values. In short, programs should not be called OD unless they posess these characteristics and every effort should be made to develop and implement programs with such characteristics.

Partial forms of OD related activities (one-shot workshops, training of individuals and groups, etc.) may still be valuable but they should be clearly distinguished from OD itself. Derr (1976:239) states that most of these activities are really OT (organizational training) rather than OD. He indicates that such forms may be useful as demonstration workshops, if they are used as a pre-condition for deciding whether to proceed to OD. Presumably they may also be helpful in developing new attitudes and skills of individuals, but we are not very optimistic that they have much positive impact on the organization. They can have a negative impact on the image of OD, if people think that they are OD, and if there is any expectation or promise that they will bring large benefits to organizational functioning.

The OT label could be usefully applied more widely to help differentiate various types of programs. In fact, much of the problem hinges on the need for careful elaboration of the meaning of the O and the D of OD. Programs which do not focus on a significant proportion of the organization qua organization (as distinct from focussing on individuals or small subgroups) are probably not OD. Approaches which involve training without linking it to the development of structures and processes designed to improve organizational functioning and the quality of life of its members are also not OD in the sense intended by most theorists and practitioners when they define OD.

Locating the presence or absence of the various definitional, entry and operating characteristics of OD described in this review, and identifying whether or not these features are implemented in a way in which practice is congruent with espoused values or intentions contribute significantly to an understanding of why OD works in some situations, but not in others. OD involves the use of particular technologies and techniques, but these are not its main distinguishing features. In the first place, "it is largely a value decision" whether or not to get into OD (Weisbord, 1978:5). In the second place, it requires the development of "a conception or way of thinking" about the organization and the individuals in it - i.e., the use of self-monitoring and conceptually guided activities vis-a-vis the components of OD defined in this review.

One of the basic messages in this review is that the values, and the conceptual bases which underly OD are far more important than its technology and techniques. And, indeed the use of the technology without a clear underlying conception which controls this use is probably harmful either to the reputation of OD or to the people exposed to these versions or to both. The future of OD is contending with both misrepresentation (labelling something OD when it is not) and misuse (applying the technology without its value and conceptual base as the primary guiding features).[36]

---

[36] Many of these points are supported by Jones and Pfeiffer (1978) Pfeiffer and Jones (1976), and Harvey (1975); the latter author claims that once OD becomes "a capitalized noun" it becomes reified and impotent. We do not agree that this is inevitable, but clearly the existence of superficial uses is evident. A reading of section I helps to clarify the more basic meaning of OD (e.g., Weisbord, 1977).

This discussion is also relevant to the issue of institutionalization of OD programs. Jones and Pfeiffer (1978) claim that to institutionalize an OD unit is to create a vested interest group in the organization which competes for scarce resources, and loses its ability to be helpful. Our review and other parts of our study (Vol. IV) illuminate the meaning of institutionalization. It does not necessarily mean the establishment of a separate unit. More generally, we take institutionalization to mean the establishment in the organization of a way of doing things consistent with OD principles and operating characteristics; for example, building the capacity of internal managers and other members to the point where OD becomes a way of life in the organization. This could be achieved either through the establishment of an OD unit, or through building it in as part of the line function of organizational members (see Adams County Case Vol. IV). Again, the implementation of the values and conceptions of OD (as defined in this review) are the primary criteria of institutionalization.

When we turn more to the use of OD in schools the question of what are the best strategies in approaching school systems is a complex one. We have seen some helpful guidelines (notably from Schmuck and Runkel) concerning the conditions for readiness, and the steps which should be taken at the entry stage. We also have a growing sense of a specific number of crucial entry and other operational factors which are essential to the success of OD in school districts (see especially, section II, school district case studies). It also seems that more attention will have to be paid to clarifying and measuring the possible benefits of OD. Whatever the range of OD impacts might be, OD would be better served if outcomes were more clearly stated and substantiated and included a focus on students and parents as well as on teachers and administrators. [37]

The current trends in OD referred to by some recent reviewers (Alderfer, 1977 and Burke, 1977), hold promise that OD is moving in the direction of becoming more adaptable and comprehensive in working with the organization as a whole. Burke (1977) identifies eight current trends which include changes: from being used in business organizations to being used in a variety of organizations; from advocating a specific managerial style to emphasizing a contingency approach; from democracy as a value to authenticity as a value; from a narrow technology (e.g., lab training) to a broader technology; from being process oriented to being an authoritative specialist; from the consultant as a change agent to the line manager as a change agent; from working almost exclusively with managers to working with both managers and people at all levels, and from being a fancy name for training to gaining organizational legitimacy. Alderfer (1977:200-210) comments on similar trends in

---

[37] As with other educational innovations, school districts do not necessarily make decisions to adopt or continue a program based on evaluation data, but such data can distinguish between implemented and non-implemented programs and their outcomes, and in the long run can help prove whether or not OD is another unfounded educational innovation. Good evaluation data can also contribute to better (less superficial) forms of diffusion

indicating that OD has broadened its scope and uses in recent years. Whether these trends are firmly or weakly in place depends on one's viewpoint. There may be a few more incidences of these trends, but whether or not they show any sign of spreading or are indicators of a future trend is open to question. In supporting these and other trends, virtually all the reviewers agree that clearer OD theories, more faithful (to the values and goals) implementation, more direct research and evaluation on the practices of OD and its outcomes, and more sharing of this information especially among practitioners are needed.

The larger question of whether OD is more effective than other alternatives to dealing with organizational problems is impossible to answer at present. This is true partly because there are many paths to organizational improvement including (a) firing ineffective personnel; (b) hiring more effective personnel; (c) training individual personnel for increased effectiveness: (d) reorganization or redesign; (e) introduction of new technology; (f) designing a new organization from the start. None of these necessarily involved the increased reflexiveness we have seen as central to OD. We have yet to see any systematic review comparing reflexive, self-analytic, OD-like approaches to the more traditional change strategies noted - either in schools or other organizations.

Most reflexively-oriented change strategies have a common core of features (they require data, they involve many of the organization's participants, they minimize expert prescription, etc.) It is probably desirable, as OD goes forward, that a range of different approaches be utilized. Labelling something "OD" or "not OD" as we have implied above is probably less important than being aware of the core factors in OD which we have outlined, and taking these into account in both practice and research. Still, things do have names, and our preference is still that a change effort should be called "OD" when it is reflexive, sustained, coherent, organization-focused, catalyst-aided, science-using, and oriented to both system and individual improvement - and called something else, like "OT", or "curriculum change", or "innovation adoption", or "performance improvement" when it is not. Sharpening the meaning and practice of OD seems preferable to dropping the label (as suggested by Harvey, 1975, and Derr, 1976) and adopting even more diffuse labels such as organization consultant. In any case, a more accurate and fully developed description of the values and theoretical and practical features of "authentic" OD is perhaps one of the main outcomes of our review of literature.

Our knowledge of the applicability and use of OD in school systems is much more limited than our knowledge about OD with other systems. We have only a handful of good case studies, most of which are recent. The reviews of the field of OD include only a passing reference to OD in schools due to the dearth of school based examples until very recently. Whether OD has a future in school systems depends largely

on whether the diffuse understanding and possible negative legacy arising from misuses of OD can be overcome by the development and spread of the kind of OD programs which take into account the definitional dimensions the values, and the operating and outcome problems raised in this review. There is some hint that the diffusion of more solid OD programs in school districts is occurring on a small scale, but there are probably as many or more failures as successes. The race against time is whether the rate of effective uses will increase fast enough to counter-balance misuses and misunderstandings of OD, and the adverse conditions retarding its use in contemporary school systems. On the other hand, successes, even modest ones, under these adverse conditions could be a powerful antidote to the many ills which plague OD as it undergoes its adolescence (Friedlander, 1976). It remains to be seen whether the diseases are curable and OD reaches adulthood. Social systems are more complex (and less elegant and efficient) than human organisms. Much more information is needed on the state of the health of OD in schools before we can comment on its future. This review has shown that we have some significant, but very ad hoc information on its use in schools. More comprehensive information is badly needed. Thus, we undertook our own empirical study to gather information on the activities of OD consultants, the extend and nature of use of sustained OD programs in school districts (see Vol. III), and more in-depth case study information on the operation of OD programs in some (three) school districts (see Vol. IV). We anticipate the reader's interest by saying that we believe our data shed a good deal of light on issues pertaining to the use of OD in school districts - issues which have previously remained in the dark.

References

Alderfer, Clayton P., "Organization development", Annual Review of Psychology, Vol. 28, pp. 197-223, 1977.

Bartunek, J.M. and C.B. Keys, "The effect of organization development training on goal agreement among school faculty members". Paper presented at the 1977 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York City.

Bassin, M. and T. Gross, "Organization development: a viable method of change for urban secondary schools". Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

Beer, M., "Comments on the preceding articles: On gaining influence and Power for OD", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1976, pp. 44-51.

Blumberg, Arthur, "O.D.'s future in schools - or is there one?", Education and Urban Society, Vol. 8, No. 2, February 1976, pp. 213-226.

Bowen, D., "Value dilemmas in Organization Development", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science", Vol. 13, Nov. 4, 1977, pp. 543-556.

Bowers, D., "OD techniques and their results in 23 organizations: the Michigan ICL study", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1973, pp. 21-43.

Bowers, D., "Organizational development: promises, performances, possibilities", Organizational Dynamics, American Management Association, New York, 1977.

Bowers, D.G,; Franklin, J.L. and P.A. Pecorella, "Matching problems, precursors, and interventions in O.D.: a systematic approach", The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 11, Nov. 4, 1975, pp. 391-409.

Buergenthal, D.A. and M.M. Milstein, "Modifications in attitudes, skills and behaviors of administrators and teachers who are trained as organization development specialists". Paper presented at the American Education Research Association conference, April 1977.

Burke, W., "Changing trends in organization development" in W. Burke (ed.) Current Issues and Strategies in Organization Development, Human Sciences Press, New York, 1977.

Coad, Rosemary A., C. Miskel and Evan Meter, "The effects of an organization development program on satisfaction, group process, climate, leadership, and student achievement". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1976.

Cohen, A. and H. Gordon, "Changing the management culture in a public school system", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1978, pp. 61-78.

Conway, James A., "Problems of entry and diagnosis in educational organizations under conditions of adversarial relationships". Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, New York, April 1977.

Conway, J. "Perspectives on evaluating a team intervention unit". Paper presented at American Education Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

Crockett, W., "No system is forever", OD Practitioner, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1978, pp. 11-13.

Deal, T.E. and C.B. Derr, "Toward a contingency theory of organizational change in education: structure, processes and symbolism". Paper prepared for Stanford-Berkeley Seminar, 1977.

Derr, C. Brooklyn (ed.), Organizational Development in Urban School Systems, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1974.

Derr, C. Brooklyn, "'O.D.' won't work in schools", Education and Urban Society, Vol. 8, No. 2, February 1976, pp. 227-241.

Derr, C.B. (ed.), Education and Urban Society, Vol. III, No. 2, 1976. Special Issue: "Schools and organizational development: applications and prospects", Sage, New York, 1976.

Derr, C.B. and A. Demb, "Entry and Urban School Systems: the context and culture of New Markets", D.B. Derr (ed), Organizational Development in Urban School Systems, Sage, New York, 1974, pp. 9-25.

Doll, Russell, C. et al., "Systems renewal in a big-city school district: the lessons of Louisville", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54, No. 8, April 1973, pp. 524 - 534.

Documentation and Technical Assistance in Urban Schools (DTA), DTA Project Overview 1977, Centre for New Schools, Chicago, Centre for Educational Policy and Management, Eugene, Oregon, 1977.

Dunn, W. and F. Swierczek, "Planned organizational change: toward grounded theory", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1977, pp. 135-157.

Fillmore, W.J. Jr., "What is O.D.? No more definitions please!" O.D. Practitioner, 1974, pp. 1-2.

Forbes, Raymond L. Jr., "Organization development: form or substance?" O.D. Practitioner, May 1977, pp. 12-13.

Franklin, Jerome L., Organization Development: An Annotated Bibliography, Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan, 1973.

Franklin, J. "Characteristics of successful and unsuccessful organization development" Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1976, pp. 471-492.

French, W. and C. Bell, Organization Development, Prentice-Hall, Toronto, 1973.

Friedlander, F., and L.D. Brown, "Organization Development", Annual Review of Psychology, Vol. 75, 1974, pp. 313-341.

Friedlander, Frank, "O.D. reaches adolescence: an exploration of its underlying values", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1978, pp. 7-21.

Fullan, M., "O.D. in schools: an overview and critique" in Organization Development, Management in Education Course, E. 321, Unit 6, Open University Press, 1976, pp. 43-51.

Golembiewski, R.G. and R. Munzenrider, "Social Desirability as an Interviewing Variable in Interpreting O.D. Effects", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1975, pp. 317-332.

Golembiewski, R.T., Billingsley, K. and S. Yeager, "Measuring change and persistence in human affairs: types of change generated by O.D. designs", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 12, No. 2., 1976, pp. 133-157.

Harvey, J., "Eight myths O.D. consultants believe in...and die by", O.D. Practitioner,, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1975, pp. 1-5.

Hayman, John L. Jr., "An overview of organization development in schools". Paper presented to the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.

Huguenin, K. and T. Deal, "Anatomy of an O.D. intervention". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.

Jones, J. and J.W. Pfeiffer, "Commentary", Group and Organization Studies, Vol. 3, No. 3, 1978, pp. 263-264.

Kahn, Robert L., "Organizational development: some problems and proposals", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 10, No. 4, 1974. pp. 485-502.

Kimberly, John R. and W. Nielsen, "Organization development and change in organizational performance", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 20 No. 2., June 1975, pp. 191-206.

Lundberg, Craig, G., "It's 1986, what's O.D. like now?", Changing Organizations, Vol. 1, No. 1, November 1976, pp. 1, 5-7.

Miles, Matthew B., "Improving schools through organizational development: an overview". In R.A. Schmuck and M.B. Miles (ed.) Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto: National Press, 1971. pp. 1-27.

Miles, Matthew B., "Critique: diffusing O.D. in schools", Education and Urban Society, February 1976, pp. 242-254.

Milstein, Mike M., "Soft (perceptual) and hard (observable behaviors) outcomes of an organizational development effort in an intermediate educational unit". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 1976.

Milstein, Mike M., "Adversarial relations and organization development: are they compatible?" Paper prepared for presentation at the American Educational Research Association, April 1977.

Milstein, M., "Evolution of an internal change team: expectations, design and reality". Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978.

Mirvis, P. and Berg, D., Failures in Organization Development and Change, Wiley-Interscience, Toronto, 1977.

Mohrman, S., A. Mohrman, R. Cooke, and R. Duncan, "A survey-feedback and problem solving intervention in a school district" in P. Mirvis and D. Berg Failures in Organization Development and Change, Wiley-Interscience, Toronto, 1977.

Nielsen, W.R. and J.R. Kimberly, "Designing assessment strategies for organization development", Human Resource Management, Vol. 15, No. 1, Spring 1976, pp. 32-39.

Pate, L. W. Nielsen, P. Bacon, "Advances in research on organization development: toward a beginning", Group and Organization Studies, Vol. 2, No. 4, 1977, pp. 449-460.

Petrella, T., "Cold cash, cold logic, and "living in the hollows of our hands"", O.D. Practitioner, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1977, pp. 1-3.

Pfeiffer, J.W. and J. Jones, "A current assessment of O.D.: What it is and why it often fails", The 1976 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators, University Associates, La Jolla, California, 1976, pp. 225-232.

Porras, J. and P. Berg, "Evaluation methodology in organization development: an analysis and critique", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 14, No. 2., 1978, pp. 151-173.

Ross, F.D. and T.E. Deal, The effects of an externally-directed organizational change intervention on the structure of a small elementary school district". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.

Runkel, P.J. and R.A. Schmuck, "Findings from the research and development program on strategies on organization change at CEPM-CASEA", Eugene: CEPM, University of Oregon, 1974.

Runkel, P.J. and R.A. Schmuck, "Organization development in schools: a review of research findings from Oregon", Eugene: CEPM, Univ. of Oregon, 1976.

Runkel, P.J. and W. Bell, "Some conditions affecting a schools' readiness to profit from O.D. training", Education and Urban Society, Vol. 8, No. 2, February 1976, pp. 127-144.

Sarason, S., The Creation of Settings and Future Societies, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Schmuck, R.A. and M.B. Miles (ed.) Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, California: National Press Books, 1971.

Schmuck, R. and P. Runkel et al, Handbook of Organization Development in Schools, Palo Alto, California: National Press Books, 1972.

Schmuck, R., "Bringing parents and students into school management", C.B. Derr, Organizational Development in Urban School Systems, Sage, New York, 1974, pp. 78-94.

Schmuck, R., D. Murray, M. Smith, M. Schwartz and M. Runkel, Consultation for Innovative Schools: OD for Multiunit Structure, Centre for Educational Policy and Management, Eugene, Oregon, 1975.

Schmuck, R., P. Runkel, J. Arends, R. Arends, The Second Handbook of Organization Development in Schools, Maryfield Pub. Co., California, 1977.

Smith, M. and G. Glass, "Meta-analysis of psychotherapy outcome studies", American Psychologist, Vol. 32, No. 19, 1977, pp. 752-760.

Tichy, M. and H. Hornstein, "Agents of planned social change: congruence of values, cognitions, and actions", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 19, 1974, pp. 164-182.

Tichy, N. and Hornstein, "Stand when your number is called: an empirical attempt to classify types of social change agents", Human Relations, Vol. 29, No. 10, 1976, pp. 945-967.

Tichy, M. and J. Nisberg, "Change agent bias: what they view determines what they do", Group and Organization Studies, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1976, pp. 286-301.

Van de Vliert, E., "Inconsistencies in the Argyris Intervention Theory", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1977, pp. 557-564.

Walton, R., and D. Warwick, "The ethics of organization development", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 9, No. 6, 1973, pp. 681-699.

Weisbord, M., "How do you know it works if you don't know what it is", OD Practitioner, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1977, pp. 1-9.

Weisbord, M., "The wizard of O.D.", OD Practitioner, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1978, pp. 1-7.